Man and God

Reflections on Religion and Christianity

Unabridged Popular Edition

The face of God you can nowhere find nor contemplate except in Christ; therefore strive to know God in Christ. For the true knowledge of God is reached neither through word-wisdom nor through thinking; rather it is a matter of an inner process that transforms the spirit God-ward.

— Oliver Cromwell (Letter to his son)

To the brave, pure heart – from youth on dedicated to strict duty-fulfilment – that alone, in never-wearying devotion, has made possible the arising and completing of the present work – in spite

of obstacles that seemed invincible –: let thanks first of all be spoken in reverence and in love

Houston Stewart Chamberlain

Bayreuth, Christmas 1922

Preface

I send a postscript ahead of this second edition as preface. Approximately at the same time as the first edition of Man and God there appeared Adolf von Harnack's Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God, whereby for the first time the figure and the teaching of the great reformer of the second century – otherwise hidden in a cloud of slanders and hostilities – was clearly unveiled before all eyes. A noble man who bore a noble life-goal for the weal of Christianity in his heart! Since now Marcion's religious convictions show striking agreements with those represented in this my book, I will dedicate a few words to them here. The God of love, the Father of Jesus Christ, is according to Marcion not identical with Yahveh, the God of the Jews: "He is not the creator, not the law-giver, not the judge, he neither rages nor punishes, but he is exclusively the embodied, redeeming and blessing love" (p. 18). Therefore – because of his world-strangeness – he is also named "the alien God." The world-creator Yahveh stands immeasurably deep under the God of love; he bears the responsibility for the misery that fills the world and for the wickedness of men; the Scripture shows him as revengeful, crafty, deceitful, angry and he chooses the Jews – "an especially bad, stubborn and unfaithful people" – (p. 113), as his chosen protégés and promises them the rule over the whole world: in short, he is an evil spirit who knows nothing of the existence of the God of love until he learns it through Jesus Christ, whom he for reward for that lets the Jews nail to the cross. His law is the opposite of religion: it leads away from the God of love instead of leading toward him. "Thus the Jew-God together with his document, the Old Testament, had to become for Marcion the actual enemy" (p. 30).

No one has more clearly seen the fundamental corruption into which Christianity through its marriage with Judaism must infallibly fall than Marcion, and he made it his life-task to free Christianity from the Old Testament and to compile for it a collection of own new holy books: Marcion is the actual originator of the New Testament. With the freeing from the Old Testament he failed however – to the lasting harm for Christianity. Harnack judges that the Church of that time did right to hold fast to the Old Testament, for the "historical vacuum that would have opened behind the Christian religion" would have been deadly for it, yet he adds the noteworthy words: "to retain the Old Testament in the 16th century was a fate from which the Reformation could not yet withdraw itself; yet to conserve it still since the 19th century as canonical document in Protestantism is the consequence of a religious and ecclesiastical paralysis" (p. 248). The question from what Christ has redeemed us has received very various answers; Marcion's answer runs refreshingly unambiguous: "Jesus Christ has redeemed us from the world and its God in order to make us children of a new and (to us) alien God" (p. 31). This short sketch may suffice to awaken the participation of the reader for one of the most significant men of all times in the field of religion. Hopefully many will reach for the mentioned excellent book of Harnack. This edition is adorned by the Christ-picture of Hans Thoma from the year 1896, which fits especially harmoniously to our book in that it shows the Saviour in free nature and glorifies him as creator of the parables of the kingdom of God. To express my warmest thanks for the generous permission to the highly revered master here is a heart-need for me! To my most gracious friend, Frau Elise Küchler in Frankfurt a. M., I am sincerely grateful for the taking-over of all works that the printing of the second edition of this book brought with it. She has taken upon herself a like work of love for several other reprints of my writings and carried it through with most careful fidelity. My helpful friend, Herr Dr. Paul Gonser, has had the great kindness to prepare a complete list of the citations from the New Testament and likewise a list of the proper names, whereby he has certainly placed many a reader under obligation of thanks. Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Bayreuth at Christmas 1922.

For Understanding

One must believe in the simplicity, in the simple, in the primal-productive, if one wishes to gain the right way. This is however not given to everyone; we are born into an artificial state and it is thoroughly easier to artificialise this ever more than to return to the simple. (Goethe) The title of this book could be understood as grandiosely world-embracing and let one expect a correspondingly bold, yes over-bold undertaking; I must at once step against such an assumption and assure: the naming "Man and God," far removed from pointing to an impossible enterprise, is according to my sense simply to indicate that the following pages are dedicated to the occupation with two concepts which concern each of us – be he also who he may – near, so near that every one in the course of a long life acquires a certain competence and therewith also a right to speak about it; it lies with the others whether they please to listen or not. About both concepts so much has been thought and so many thoughts have been communicated – frequently by the most significant thinkers and the most exalted saints – that none will easily imagine himself able to contribute new enlightenment; in any case the author of the present work does not imagine it; yet he means that out of new needs arise new tasks, and herein lies the justification of such an attempt, which reaches its purpose as soon as it only renders welcome help to some needy souls. With such a project it comes in the first rank to determine exactly the standpoint of the contemplator: in this book the layman speaks, not the cleric; the man of the world speaks, not the specialist scholar. True, this man of the world has stood near the relevant questions his life long and honestly striven to inform himself – whereby he spared no trouble always to find out the most significant, the most thorough, the most reliable and to appropriate it to himself as far as his lay-education permitted, and indeed this best alone with fundamental disregard of everything inferior and especially everything fantastic and dilettantish: from this follows a knowledge of the results of learned researchers and their fructification, yet not the spirit-direction of the professional scholar with its advantages and limitations. One may not overlook that with the questions treated here much far surpasses every learning, so that thinking-force and soul-depth mean more than knowledge; while on the other hand the results of those researches for which extensive philological and historical knowledge are needful can be understood and taken up by every educated layman. A most significant among the newer religion-researchers, F. Crawford Burkitt, says about this: "There lies nothing at all in the nature of the subjects treated by us theologians that would be suited to hinder the attentive reader from accompanying every step of the path traversed; also he can claim the right to judge whether he will follow us or not" (The Gospel History and its Transmission, 3rd ed., p. 7). The German reader will do well to imprint these words upon himself; for the exaggerated estimation of the decisive meaning, not alone of the knowledge of the specialist scholars, but also of their judgment, works fatal; whoever does not preserve for himself the full independence of judgment renounces the dignity of a free man and loses therewith at the same time the capacity to appropriate really to himself that which has been gained through the learned works; it is better to understand many things falsely than to submit will-less to the judgment of others – from which no soul-conviction, rather only a pale holding-for-true results. Here a remark must be inserted by the way that, without possessing great meaning, is nevertheless not unimportant for the judgment of the present work. The special conditions under which this work came to execution made the searching in books and notes difficult in such a measure that one had to proceed as sparingly as possible therewith; whoever therefore heeds only the writings named in the text will presuppose a far narrower foundation of the carried-out studies than that which in reality lies present. From this also explains itself the lacking of many a name rightly expected. This be spoken once for all in brevity.

The mention of gaps reminds me further to make attentive distant readers that I already in several of my books found the occasion to occupy myself thoroughly both with the general questions of all religion and with many related single questions, single periods and single personalities – I name Richard Wagner, The Foundations, Words of Christ, Aryan World-View, Immanuel Kant, Goethe, German Essence, Paths of Life: my invincible aversion against repetitions has caused me to presuppose all these places as known. For the standpoint of the author there would further to be taken into account race-belonging, course of education and life-fate: the answering of these questions is given by my book Paths of Life of my Thinking that appeared in the year 1919. With a book dedicated to religion the question after the intention out of which it arose comes especially into meaning. To this I answer best historically. The first impulse to write a book about religion I received about eighteen years ago from a SouthGerman publisher; this one had been caused by Otto Pfleiderer, the in widest circles known, only shortly before deceased Berlin theologian, to turn to me, in that he held me, on the ground of the sections about Jesus Christ and about religion and Church-history in my Foundations, capable of carrying out a generally comprehensive popular work. However much this proposal also allured me, never have I been able to decide to take its execution in hand: I had to fear, on the one side to get into the shoreless, on the other side to find no occasion to say that which I had upon the heart to say. Later revered friends – among whom I will name only Julius Wiesner and Leopold von Schröder – pressed upon me to compose a writing of quite different kind: a sort of religious confession or a narration of my most personal religious experiences. Also this impulse I have not been able to decide to follow: a certain shy-feeling held me from it. The words of the "beautiful soul" sounded in my ears: "Had I only always been silent and sought to preserve the pure mood in my soul! Had I only not let myself be led by circumstances to step forth with my secret!" Nevertheless there circled unceasingly in the innermost mind the longing to make present to myself some of the most blessing heart-experiences through shaping as clearly as possible, together with the idea that such an undertaking could grant the friends of my writings some joy and perhaps also guidance. One day this wish gained commanding force: I laid my other works out of the hand and dedicated myself to this (compare Paths of Life, p. 152). If I narrate this so circumstantially, it happens because I have become conscious that the two proposals that did not come to execution have nevertheless influenced the present writing: without Pfleiderer's impulse I would perhaps yet not have looked so far around as has happened here; and had not the thought of a confession-writing long occupied me, I would hardly have fallen upon the limitation that now commands and has created this book, true not into an express, yet notwithstanding into a secret confession. Especially the latter circumstance possesses for the "standpoint" of the author that we seek to determine decisive meaning: have I also everywhere drawn facts and learned results according to the measure of that which stood at my disposal, yet have I almost at no place ventured beyond the boundary of that which in the course of life has become a heart-confession for me; for where this was not the case I felt myself wavering and found no joy in presenting mere opinions. True I have everywhere held strictly to myself in the conviction that one says more when one leaves the last words unspoken; nevertheless the right feeling for this book finds only that one who perceives the heart-beat therein.

I. Man and God

Man and God In the purity of our bosom surges a striving to give itself freely out of gratitude to a Higher, Purer, Unknown. Unravelling for itself the eternally Unnamed. (Goethe) Yes, there is a god in man. (Carlyle) Man and God are two ideas – or let us rather say, in order to speak at once more exactly – Man and God are two thought-shapes (ideas) that call each other forth mutually and insofar condition each other. No people of the world is known that harboured only the one without supplementing it through the other. The researches of the last half-century have – in contrast to the hitherto fairly general assumption – shown irrefutably: the thought of a Godhead and indeed of a uniformly presented (monotheistic), invisible, all-present one is lacking with no tribe of the earth, whereby especially noteworthy appears that this Godhead has at first nothing to do with priestly religion-teachings and with cult, but stands and works upon the dark background of the mind woven out of half-consciousness and unconsciousness as unavoidable thought-shape with nature-necessity. All complications of many-goddery, all brooding formation of forced articles of faith (dogmas), all divine-service delusion-thoughts are the product of later culture-stages and leave mostly the thought-shape of the One primal-God untouched, even if pressed back behind the variegation of the new ideas. Of this God even a Euripides speaks as of "the ethereal Zeus beyond all heavens" (Frgm. 911), and at the time of the ascending Christianity an embittered opponent of the new teaching, Maximus of Madaura, says: "There is only One highest and unique God, without beginning and without end, whose forces spread in the world we call under various designations because we do not know his true name ….." [Footnote: After Cumont: The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. German ed. 1910, p. 244.] Ethnologists and missionaries have only therefore discovered the fact of this all-spread one-God-idea late, because the wild-living men are accustomed to leave this their God-thought unmentioned partly out of shy, partly out of dull indifference. What amount of vain work, what floods of ruinous hate, what streams of blood could we Europeans have spared ourselves if we had held it worth the trouble to hear the exalted teacher who two and a half thousand years ago discovered the hidden ground-features of the human mind and as true Hellene presented them in graspable pictures! True Plato has after and after upon the mysterious ways of a spirit-over-power pressing itself unnoticed gained not-to-be-measured influence upon our thinking in its whole breadth; from the finest-spun brain-web of our theologians to the researches of our natural science – we all are Platonists without knowing it; yet precisely the mid-point of his thinking – the teaching of the thought-shapes – remains still always a plaything for specialists instead of, as that should be the case, fructifying our life and pointing directions to it. This mid-point forms the discovery that all thought-shapes are creations of the human spirit – and I add, of the spirit of single gifted men who summarised an unrestricted number of appearances, experiences or thoughts through such a creation into a surveyable unity, whereby at the same time light was brought into the darkening of an over-full idea-world and the load that the brain has to bear was significantly lightened. Not even the very simplest of such thought-shapes – the concepts under which we are accustomed to present summarisingly the utensils manufactured by ourselves – are in reality mere names for present things: always something of poetry is thereby and therewith at the same time a hovering, unclearly bounded, changing. How we unlearned ones marvel when we experience in Kluge's Etymological Dictionary of the German Language of the bed familiarly home-like to us that the Indo-Germanic root of this word means "to dig," in further old transformations then pit and vault, "dug-in resting-place," and points in another development-series to dung and manure! If we research further and look up for example in Bethge's Primal Time (p. 46) or Meringer's The German House (pp. 59 ff.), we experience that the word "bed" originally designated earth-caves that were dug as protection-spaces at the approaching of winter and for the warmth's sake were over-roofed with dunglayers, in order then to serve those primal men, who otherwise were accustomed to drive their essence by night as by day under free heaven, as sleeping-places and also as spinning-rooms. The present concept "bed" – which in reality, as Plato often emphasises, is a thought-shape (idea) – hangs therefore with the word extremely loosely together, which should again make us attentive that even in this simplest case the thing and the thought-shape by no means cover each other, rather the latter

adapts itself glidingly to the most various relations, never lets itself be caught into immovable concept-determinations, thus bears the essence of a Fata morgana, of a melting shadow-shape upon itself. Since to most present men thinking – especially every thinking about thinking – is unaccustomed and therefore burdensome, I add a humorous anecdote that all the more charms as it relates to Hero Hindenburg [Footnote: The following anecdote I owe to a participant at the relevant table-round; yet years have meanwhile passed and I do not guarantee for literal exactness of the wording.]. The fieldcommander had one evening invited a professor of philosophy who as reserve-officer passed through his headquarters to table. In the course of the conversation the scholar got a little deep into his specialty, which caused the warrior some trouble, at last also weariness. Here too he knew how to help himself. “Herr Major, excuse the interruption! Set the case that I take a hand-large board, rectangular or rounded, and draw row-wise 500 strong pig-bristles through: that I may yet name a brush, not true?” – The astonished scholar stutters embarrassed: “Without question… certainly, Excellence.” – “If I however draw only 300 bristles through, may I then still always speak of a brush?” – The ever more embarrassed specialist nods smiling his affirmation. Now the warrior feels that he holds the hilt in the hand, and climbs confidently cheerful ever deeper down with the number of the bristles; the philosopher becomes increasingly embarrassed and finally at 10 bristles takes the courage to interject that there one can well yet not more speak of a brush. Under thundering laughter of the table-round Hindenburg calls out: “There have I again learned something: to the concept of a brush belongs a minimal number of 11 bristles!” The warrior had grasped deeper than he himself divined, in that he through an intuitive example uncovered that even our very simplest words relating to everyday objects correspond not to actual things but to thoughts, and thus on German are best designated as “thought-shapes.” If it now behaves thus with the simplest things of human invention, where one yet should believe that the shape of the relevant objects and the shape of the thoughts summarising them arise at the same time and would cover each other exactly, so lets itself easily be imagined how great the distance turns out when nature itself offers the objects that our fantasy must first appropriate and our thinking must first unite, separate and order before we can pass over to the creation of thought-shapes. There lies for example a bold thought-shaping of the human spirit in the setting-up of the unitary concept “dog”; we know yet today that the animals that we designate with this common name spring from at least three different wild stems also specifically separated by the science and have first arisen through boundless crossing as intermediate stages (see Keller); it is and remains impossible to give a unitary, securely bounded, unassailable concept-determination of the thought-shape “dog”; Hindenburg’s teaching of the “11 bristles” would here break through at all corners and ends. Still more arbitrarily do we proceed to work as soon as not things, that is not sense-perceived appearances, but merely concepts, sensations, presentiments etc. make out the “stuff” out of which we undertake to build up thought-shapes: I name finitude, infinity, virtue, sin, freedom, immortality… All these ideas are creations of our spirit, and indeed at their origin creations of definite men on definite days, that then after and after under all thinkable distortions and mutilations penetrated into the stock of the general consciousness, – whereby well to remark is that all finer thought-shapes remain possession of a minority, while the mass talks of them – as today of freedom – without in the least divining what is stated and can be stated therewith to consider, whether we would not do well to go still further and to ask ourselves earnestly whether all beings that show man-shape – and be they also white Europeans of Nordic descent – deserve spiritually and morally the designation man. I use the word “deserve” not in the sense of a judging, rather am I only concerned that the idea man could lose every content, and only the “two legs without wings” would remain over. If namely the stages from man to man are quite many and between below and above a mighty cleft yawns, then we lose through the violent unification into the thought-shape man more in insight than we gain through this genial invention. Goethe goes here as always ahead with the example, in that his known teaching of the limited and also according to degree different immortality lets conclude upon enormous differences between man and man. I remind among other things of the words that Eckermann reports from the 1st of September 1829: “We are not immortal in equal way, and in order to manifest oneself in future as great reality (entelechy), one must also be one.” Also upon Kant is to be pointed.

The never-resting working of his long life he summarises thus: he has "wished to teach what one must be in order to be a man" – from which goes forth that we according to Kant's conviction, in any case according to the majority, are still no men, with other words: we do not correspond to this idea as it had gained clearest thought-through shape in the brain of the reflecting world-wise. Thus we see clearly that it is a matter with the idea man – as with all thought-shapes – of a shiftable idea that can be grasped further or narrower, more definite or more blurring, noble-natured or common. To the Aryan Indians hovered an exalted dream-picture – the perfect man should, thanks to the inner purification and heightening, as it were overcoming his corporality, strip it off and become "God"; the counterpart hereto offer us the Hellenes, to whom uniquely the perfectly beautiful, harmoniously announcing himself man counted as true man, so that also for the gods there was nothing higher than to equal beautiful men; against that our Nordic forefathers regarded only undaunted heroes as men; to these alone a beyond opened itself; whereas the remaining beings in man-shape belonged to the mere nature-forces that today fill the world with their busyness and tomorrow are blown into nothing. Thus distinguishes itself even within the same race stem from stem and mankind-ideal from mankind-ideal.

Still more complicated becomes the question and still more difficult the setting-up of an unambiguous concept man in consequence of the fact that within the same community, be it through the seeping-in of foreign blood, be it through the effect of changed life-conditions and earlier not present spiritual influences, often transformations take place, thanks to which a people is scarcely more to be recognised as the same. Thus we experience for example under the entire population of middle and western Europe a remarkable ascent that begins about in the middle of the 13th century and holds approximately until toward the middle of the 17th century: one believes to perceive a general increase of the life-feeling and therewith at the same time of the consciousness of the man-dignity; and indeed this upswing concerns all estates – the peasant and craftsman not less than the burgher, the nobility, the learned estate and the creating artist. Upon the slow ascent follows a quick fall: the disenfranchised peasant becomes sullen and dull, the craftsman entangled into politics loses his earlier so beneficially striking cheerfulness, the burgher forfeits the confidence and the self-trust, the nobility begins more to look upon riches than upon honour, the absolute-become princes fall into the boundless ….. This all however concerns first more the outer life-holding and the life-courage than the inner soul-life, which not alone in Germany but also in England, France, Spain and Italy during this time of the decline drives special blossoms of tender inwardness (age of the music). Now however toward the end of the 18th century the great overturn sets in, which will well one day be recognised as the most frightful catastrophe that has ever struck our race, so that one may ask oneself whether the man-dignity is at all still to be saved; I speak of the mechanization and the industrialisation of life conditioned thereby. Well would it have been possible from the beginning to lead this development into other tracks, for which we find approaches with philanthropically minded employers and with genial workers at the beginning of the 19th century – thoughts that still found entrancing expression in the book Histoire d'un Ruisseau of the noble dreamer Elisée Reclus; yet had meanwhile Satan, in shape of the press, already seized the occasion to erect his kingdom upon earth, and before the falling poison of this apparent-soul of the brutal, dumb, aimless machine every good intention sank deadly struck away. Gifted with the incomprehensible sharp-sight of the born poet-seer, our Schiller – although he already in 1805 closed the eyes over this world and thus only lived through the very first beginnings of the overturn – has struck the fatal kernel-point. He writes: "Eternally only fettered to a single small fragment of the whole, the man forms himself only as fragment; eternally only the monotonous noise of the wheel that he drives around in the ear, he never develops the harmony of his essence, and instead of impressing the mankind in his nature, he becomes merely an imprint of his business, of his science" (Aesthetic Education, Letter 6). Schiller's prophetic glance remains, as one sees, not sticking at the factory-worker who literally "drives a wheel," rather he embraces our entire civilisation penetrated by mechanical methods and ways of thinking. And this glance shows him the inescapable devaluation of the man as man. Hereby the following is to be considered. Every perfection – whereby I wish to say, every appearance that visibly approaches the perfection – requires a certain all-sided rounding-off, a relation of the parts to one another that enables an independent self-sufficing

within given limits; to all that in any sense of the word deserves the designation "culture" comes this property of the rounding-off. Against that an organic "fragment" – as which Schiller designates the present man – is always a broken thing, because connection-less, dependent upon the arbitrariness of others. How grandly for example stands the peasant and in general the countryman there, in himself rounded-off and in the essential things self-sufficing! With all that he does he knows exactly the why and the wherefore; every acting is at the same time a thinking; he serves the nature in that he makes it serviceable to his purposes, and becomes thus himself a piece of living nature. At the other end of the stage-series stands the present factory-worker, whose million-floods threaten to drown us. His whole "work" is prescribed to him through arbitrariness; true he needs thereby mostly the skill, yet a purely mechanical skill, and there consists no inner connection between brain and hand; all that he does is in and for itself purposeless and obtains first later, through the activity of other brains, a purpose. Therefore the impossibility for him to find satisfaction in his work; instead of, as with the countryman, being content of the life, forms for him his "work" merely a mechanical means to gain the life-support, the support thus of another life that however to live he is too tired and too unprepared. Uniquely a planned, systematic counter-working would here have been able to ward off the most evil consequences: more than others would this mechanical worker have needed a noble training of the understanding and a rich filling-out of the fantasy, thereto healthy rural air and land-occupation – the latter took place at the beginnings of the weaving in England, the former is demanded in the above-named book of Elisée Reclus. The opposite of all that happened. Not alone were the forces of the factory-worker in the first decades misused up to exhaustion, but still before the legislation had begun to steer this evil, was – as already remarked above – the press arrived into the firmly founded possession of its all-power and had especially completely subjugated the worker-estate. Destruction of the judgment-force and uprooting of the inborn stirrings of the mind: those were the main goals of this Satan. As is known stands the entire press that I have here in mind – that far beyond the factory-worker rules nine tenths of the burgher-estate – in Jewish possession and Jews work also as business-leaders, editors, critics etc. thereby decisively. Whether there really exists a Jewish secretbond that has set itself the bodily, spiritual and moral destruction of the Indo-European and with him of his culture as consciously pursued goal, I know not; I believe the mere instinct of this through millennia bred "plastic demon of the decay of mankind," as Richard Wagner names him (Know Thyself) suffices; all the more since here, as otherwise everywhere, his immediate business-interests cover themselves with that goal. With horror-exciting swiftness shot here the harm into the height; in the great war we already beheld the naked lie as ruler of the whole world "in triumphing security." Admitted yet shortly before the beginning of the war a leading journalist of the United States: "If it ever occurred to one of us to write the truth, he would on the next day be bread-less" (Brooks: Corruption in American Politics and Life, 1910, p. 122). And the sociologist Professor Ward says: "Newspapers are simply tools of the deceit" (loc. cit.). Thus stands the overwhelming majority of the present mankind – that draws almost its whole knowledge and opinion out of newspapers – already outside the possibility at all to experience true things; not alone upon the fields of politics and of the economy is it led astray according to the arbitrariness of those wire-pullers, rather surrounds it the deceit-building of a lied science, of a lied art, of a lied thinking and of a poison-pregnant writing-system. Relatively few are in the position through comprehensive education to escape this hell created by the press and to arrive at freedom of the judgment. The wise among us have known from the beginning whither the predominance of the press must lead – yes, must: there was no escaping. Already in January 1813 writes Goethe to Reinhard: "It is incredible what harm the Germans do themselves through the journaland daily-sheet-scribbling: for the good that is thereby furthered must at once be swallowed by the mediocre and the bad." With these few words is the kernel of the matter laid bare: with an appearance like the press it is not otherwise possible than that all perhaps present, still so honest and energetic good intentions are "swallowed" by the bad ones! One single thing would at best have been able to steer the otherwise invincible evil: the timely energetic intervening of a wise state-power. Also here had already Goethe warned: "After press-freedom cries no one except who wishes to misuse it" (Maxims, edition of the G. G., No. 972). Yet who hears upon such words? The "freedom of the

press" became the field-cry of all parties, and whoever dared to represent another insight was mocked out of the political life as petrified blockhead. I point for comparison to our market- and goods-police. One consider what great development this above all in Germany has gained in the course of a century: not alone may healthdamaging and in general falsified goods not come to sale, but also harmless substitute-means must under heavy penalty be made known as such. The state does here its duty in that it protects according to forces the healthy, honest totality against the deceitful machinations of conscience-less swindlers and does not let itself be held off by the phrase that the people will know how to protect itself. And yet would the men far rather have understood to protect themselves against every bodily threat than against the soul-poison daily offered to them. "For the danger is yes with the buying of knowledge much greater than with food-means" – as Socrates in Plato's Protagoras remarks. The state that here failed was worth that it went to ground. Thus stands then the already to a fragment smashed, of the harmoniously rounded-off freedom bereaved man soul-less there, robbed of his true-dreams, full of envy yet without hopes, full of hate and bare of every love. We all know the pity- and horror-exciting faces upon whose foreheads the brandmark of the reverence-lessness has been pressed, whose temples show themselves as if touched by a demon of the unfruitfulness, out of whose eyes the reflection of the heaven has departed and whose mouth-corners express a bitterness for which there is no more comfort upon earth. Since now, as we have established, the concept man is a thought-shape (idea) and – as all thoughtshapes – shiftable and changing according to the brains that shape them, according to their richness or poverty, according to their noble-sense or commonness, so lets itself easily be thought how different even within the same people-family under one and the same word man is thought and presented. One attempt to make present to oneself the thoughts of the king Mohampatuah, at the lower Congo, in the evening after he has just consumed his cousin, about this subject and then to compare them with those of Socrates shortly before he emptied the hemlock-cup! The difference will scarcely be greater than that between idea and ideal of the man in the heads – let us say – on the one side of (((Liebknecht))), on the other side of Bismarck. From this follows that we are not entitled to use the concept man as a known magnitude, still less as designation for a secure, undisputed fact: the one storms with this thought-shape the heaven, driven by the glowing longing after perfection, the other lowers – precisely thanks to his education and mis-education, thanks to his outer civilisation with inner mind-brutalisation – the idea of the man and therewith at the same time the man himself far under the reason-less beast. As Montaigne says: Il y a plus de distance de tel à tel homme, qu'il n'y a de tel homme à telle bête (I. 1, ch. 42: there consists a greater distance between man and man than between many a man and many a beast). For the present this result suffices us, in that it serves us as spring-board to the second question – that after the thought-shape God.

Already at the beginning we saw the concepts man and God hang so tightly together that they are not at all to be separated from one another; if the idea of the man-dignity rises, so becomes at the same time the idea of God a worthier one, and conversely. Also here has Plato pointed the way, in that he showed that numerous thought-shapes appear pairwise, and then form a shiftable structure within which each of the two shapes stands crosswise to the other, partly supplementing it, partly cancelling it – about as male and female. So behaves it for example with the ideas introduced by him of species and genus: whoever thinks the concept species cannot otherwise than think the concept genus at the same time and conversely, so exactly is the one demanded through the other; at the same time are these two thoughtshapes so shiftable against one another that every species can be expanded to a genus and every genus contracted to a species – shiftings that we experience daily in the descriptive natural sciences [Footnote: Hereto would Kant's entrancing remarks be to compare about this "double, mutually conflicting interest of the reason, on the one side the interest of the extent (of the generality) in regard to the genera, on the other side of the content (of the definiteness), in intention upon the manifoldness of the species" (Critique of Pure Reason, section "Critique of all Speculative Theology," 2nd ed., pp. 680 ff.).]. Between man and God exists true not an equal relation, yet always a comparable one:

the relations between these two thought-shapes are just as tight and insoluble, yet more mysterious and hard to make graspable in sober words. With the shape-pair genus and species both members of the pair relate themselves in the last end to visible appearances; whereas it is characteristic for man and God that this pair overflies the limits of the experience (the specialists say: transcends) and always glides over and back – out of the visibility into the invisibility, out of the graspability into the ungraspability, out of the presentability into the unpresentability, and again back into the visibility, the graspability and the presentability. That precisely belongs to the essence of this thought-shape-pair: the thought man points from the very first moment in which it is thought out of this world into another, only divined one, whereas the thought God draws that divined other world into this visible one. In that the man distinguishes himself from the remaining creature, he arrogates to himself spirit-gifts and properties of the mind – or we can also say, he discovers them in himself – that compel him to gain for the new dignity a new powerful support-point; if the picture does not appear all too bold, I would like to say: he must throw an anchor (as it were upward) into an earlier to him unknown element, that offers him not only in the storms of the life secure hold, but upon which he can after and after hoist himself always higher. Against that it is natural and necessary to the God-thought to strive down into the world of the visibility, into the world of the man, where alone it gains reality. Often point our mystics thereto how exactly the thought-shape God is conditioned through the thought-shape man. One think to oneself the of his man-hood conscious man not present in the world-all, the concept God is nowhere more thought, it is extinguished as if it had never been: with the man vanishes also his God away; with right dens Angelus Silesius: I know that without me God cannot live a now; Become I to nothing, he must for need give up the spirit. Not less vanishes God away as soon as the man loses the thought of his man-dignity; for the assumption that such a man would nevertheless recognise God at his works rests upon a false presupposition. Pascal has irrefutably demonstrated that the nature reveals no divine, rather God shows himself in it only to those who already believe God; for every appearance that the apologete draws for the proof of the existence of God can with equal right be led for the opposite (Pensées, Nos. 242–244, 557 etc.). The faith in God goes ahead and arises, as said, originally as thought-necessity. There step with the time all sorts of other appearances thereto: spirit-faith, demon-faith, gods-faith with all cults and observances gone forth therefrom, and – as we will soon see – it is accustomed that the original God-idea vanishes into the background before the more complicated apparatus; yes, it is characteristic for the in this way gained thought of God that it mostly leads its own life outside the cults and dogmas; becomes it also later interwoven with them, yet remains to a sharper eye its essence as that of a foreign guest not hidden. About this subject stands namely a rich store of reliable reports at our disposal; for that fact of the allpresence of the God-thought upon the whole earth, fleetingly mentioned already at the beginning of this chapter, surprising our science, belongs according to my conviction hereto: it is a matter first not of an in any way concluded, felt, divined creator-God – as our religion-researchers manifoldly conclude – but rather of a thought that also the simplest, in reflecting most unpractised head cannot avoid to think: therefore the exception-less generality of the thought and at the same time its relative paleness. The in these questions still unversed reader grasp first to Andrew Lang's The Making of Religion, P. W. Schmidt's The Origin of the God-Idea and to Leopold von Schroeder's Aryan Religion, Volume I, from where he can find the way to further literature. Under every heaven-strip, in the north and south as upon the equator, in Asia and America as in Australia, Oceania and Africa, all-over where there only are man-like creatures, there finds itself the idea of a highest being – the idea of God – as it were (as Lang expresses himself) "of an enlarged supernatural man." Characteristic for this highest being is that it is always presented as good, frequently also as watcher of the virtue, that (thus for example with the allegedly low-standing Australian blacks) teaches chastity, compassion, unselfishness and fidelity against the given word. Not less characteristic is however the small space that this being takes in the public cult, in that it only remains upon the dark background of the consciousness, while all sorts of spirit- and demon- and also gods-spook spreads itself in the foreground of the life.

This God is too holy to be much led in the mouth, and too goodness-full to be feared; therefore he steps back before the circumstantial magical rites dedicated to the defence of evil demons and before the sacrifice-festivals celebrated in honour of the ancestors and the good spirits. The less civilised, the freer from priesthood and from all religion-customs, the more clearly is the nearness of this pure God felt, and the more effective prove themselves the moral commands that are led back upon him – as examples I name the Andamanese islanders and the bushmen; with the arising of religious customs and especially of a priesthood darken themselves both idea and teaching, since the men now lay the main value upon definite cult-actions, word-formulas, sacrifice-prescriptions and the like. Yet vanishes this oldest and most genuine thought-shape God never and nowhere wholly away, can also not, because it, as said, springs from an inescapable thought-necessity and only there goes lost to the spirit where the concept man loses all validity; wherefore this God-thought always returns upon the peaks of religious life and also today possesses meaning, as I will soon show. Beforehand I would like still a moment to remain with the good, much-slandered wild ones. Instructive find I it to experience the names that the primal men use for the designation of this divine. Frequently it is called the Father, the great Father, our all-present Father, or the Old, the Old of the heaven, the old man (in the sense of a from ever been-there), very frequently also the Good, the Benefactor, the great Friend, elsewhere the Heavenly, the Heaven-Lord, the Old in the heaven-land, sometimes also shortly the Heaven, more rarely it is called the Lord or the Master. These naive namings mean just so many testimonies for the origin of the idea of a highest being (God) out of the demand of a counterpart to the idea man. For, to recognise oneself as man means to distinguish oneself fundamentally from all remaining life and means the resolve to assert oneself as a Higher – with higher rights, demands and expectations. This closes necessarily in itself the idea of a over-man (to use Goethe's expression), of a better self, of a helper and finally of a master. The already on pages 21 ff. executed be here repeated. The thought-shape man can be interpreted as a movement of the whole essence upward: in order that this movement gain consistency, must something come to meet it from above – and see there! this expectation is not deceived: a highest, good, friendly, fatherly being inclines itself down out of the heaven. Even the wild ones of South Guinea say: "This God alone has no priests, this alone converses immediately with the men" (A. Lang, loc. cit., 3rd ed., p. 220). Whether this being be of pure spiritual kind or also bodily is not accustomed to be asked, just as little whether the property of a world-creator comes to it or not; it proves itself just everywhere as the pure thought-shape God. That this thousand-fold witnessed fact could remain so long unrecognised, we owe to the prejudices of our scientists and evolution-dogmatists – at their head Herbert Spencer. These had set up the forced teaching that primal peoples might possess no idea at all of God, just as little any still so simple moral concepts; and now finds itself that precisely with the most uncultivated tribes upon earth the thought God and with it moral teachings, worthy of the Sermon on the Mount, are met in special purity. A scientifically educated evangelical missionary who possesses rich experience under the wild ones writes about this: "That this purer God-idea is to be the result of a long development, in the sense that the peoples beginning with animistic ideas, under the pressure of the fear progressed to animal- and ancestor-worship and from there to nature-worship, out of which the gods grew, whereupon one worked oneself up through a richer polytheism to the gradually purified idea of the One God (so runs namely the named forced teaching) – this hypothesis contradicts the picture that everyone who becomes familiar with the real heathendom and does not look at it through a glass gains of it. The Godidea lies not in the way of the

development out of the spirit-service, it contradicts this development. It is a foreign body in the animistic idea-world. It stands in opposition to the nature-deities, to the conception of the soul as an all-matter, to the demons and ancestors who have wrested God's power out of the hands, in opposition also to the rigid fate that removes God out of the world, thus in opposition to all factors determining the animistic religious life" (J. Warneck: The Life-Forces of the Gospel, Mission-Experiences within the Animistic Heathendom, 1913, 5th ed., pp. 96 ff.). This testimony is all the more valuable as the author belongs to the strict ecclesiastical Christianity and consequently had to overcome own prejudices before he recognised the truth. As to him, so has it gone to all his thinking colleagues, for which one finds numerous proofs in the named work. The fact of this original, all-over to-be-met God-faith can at all no more be drawn into question, uniquely its interpretation remains still a disputed point: I for my part am convinced to have given the right explanation in the above. Herewith falls however at the same time new light upon the history of all religion; for one will find that this pure God-concept – gone forth out of unavoidable thought-necessity and inseparably bound with the concept of the man – might it still so much be pressed back and darkened by the colourful mass of fantastic ideas and absurd notions, nevertheless lives further everywhere and in peaking appearances always again breaks forth in full purity. If we fly courageously upon the highest of all peaks, so we perceive the prayer that begins with the words: Our Father who art in heaven – and feel ourselves at once transported to the good Andamanese and other primal men who would recognise in these words literally exactly their own presenting and speaking! Already the venerable Livingstone, who as first among the whites entered the dark forests of middle Africa, reports astonished: "Also the very lowest of these tribes one needs not first to persuade to the faith in the existence of God, all without exception harbour in themselves this conviction" (Missionary Travels after Lang). Always again, as one sees, the pure idea of the one-God, not as last result of high civilisation and culture or even refined Godlearning, rather as nature-drive of all still childlike men without exception and then as blossom of the religious thought-world of the highest gifted. I named the Our Father; for supplement I point now to another world – to that of the brahmanic Indians. Under a mythology that in the course of long times like a tropical primal forest always denser, always more impenetrable fantastically up-grew, was after and after the simple – true distant, yet at the same time penetrating – idea of the good being, of the Father in heaven, almost vanished from the consciousness. There found themselves high-minded men, deep thinkers, who led by the instinct of pure-bred race sought the way back into the simple and shrank before no violence in order to reach this goal. What the Andamanese and Jesus had found like a flower by the way, thither must the Indians first fight themselves through the impenetrable thicket of most luxuriant fantasies. As soon as they have wrestled themselves through to the original thought-shapes, they grasp them therefore with a fervour that insofar almost murderously works, as an excess of will always clouds the purity of the knowledge. Nevertheless succeeds it to them – precisely in the excess of their longing desire – something to achieve something unique and eternal: the grasping, comprehending and exhausting of the two thoughtshapes Man and God, and indeed at the same time as completely abstract concepts and as so living experiences that they determine direction and content of the whole existence. It cannot be my intention at this place to describe the religious thought-life of the Upanishads; it suffices if I remind of the two peak-points – Brahman (God) and Atman (the man's Self). Instead of falling with the blind rage of the Jewishly inflamed youthful Christianity destroying upon the blooming shapes of the nature-gods, the Indians let God speak: All that is mighty and beautiful and luxuriant, That, know, is a part of my force. Whereto the old-Indian explainer remarks: "Everywhere namely where a especially high degree of his (God's) power-unfolding shows itself, there is this recommended as (personal) God to worship" (Çankara: The Sutras of the Vedanta, 1, 1, 11). Yet behind these consciously invented shapes rises the one unique true idea of God. Already the name with which these wise ones designate the pure thoughtshape God witnesses not alone for the depth of their reflection, but also for the degree in which it had succeeded to them to find the way back to the purity of a first innocent knowledge.

The word Brahman stems namely from the Sanskrit for "prayer" – and indeed prayer not as with the Greeks grasped as a wishing, nor as with the Latins as a word-making, nor as with the Persians as a demanding, nor as with the Russians as a softening, nor even as with the Hebrews as a smoking, "but as the toward the Holy, Divine upward-striving will of the man" (Paul Deussen: The System of the Vedanta, p. 128). The upward-striving will! This corresponds exactly to the version that we brought above (pp. 20 ff.) for the arising of the God-idea out of the knowledge of the man of his man-hood and the from here resulting unavoidable need after a over-human that leads and directs his "upward-striving will." Only by the way. I mention that this God exactly as with the primal men also in India bears the by-name "the Good." And now these deep-sense researchers of last questions laid the reverse way back, from God to the man; here sinks God with such fervour into "the lotus-flower of the man-heart" that at last this man feels God's immediate presence overpoweringly and himself becomes God. As soon namely as two crosswise mutually supplementing ideas melt into one another in such a way, both cancel themselves and we arrive at an All that is hard to distinguish from a Nothing. The thinking possesses just not the constitution to embrace and to dissect the truth; every thought that is thought ruthlessly to the outermost end leads into the empty. Before they reached so far, had however the Indians grasped the thought-shape God in a purity as that with consciousness has never otherwise happened. Especially the emptiness of this idea at understanding- and sense-determinations is by them masterly presented; for in truth it is a matter of a movement of the soul, of a mighty stirring of the will; God is, as the name Brahman rightly says – a prayer, not a knowledge. We can state nothing about God – nothing at all, except that we as men need him. The word Brahman is neither masculine nor feminine, but neuter, just as the Greek Theion and the word "God" in the Nordic and in the Gothic; the latter received first later, under Christian influence, the masculine gender. It is a matter of a Divine about which nothing nearer can be determined, of "a remaining thought in the soul," as our Eckhart expresses himself – a knowledge that he supplements through the words: "who is to behold God, he must be blind." The Indian wise one, requested by his pupil to describe God to him, answers: "Neti, neti!" – he is not so and he is not so; what we again meet literally with Master Eckhart: "Speak I now: God is good, it is not true, more: I am good, God is not good: etc." Beautifully it is said of God in the Taittiriyaka-Upanishad: Before whom the words turn around And the thoughts, without finding him. As contrast and at the same time for supplement be here pointed to the related utterance of a Hellenic wise one. In his known apologetic writing Octavius narrates Minucius Felix the following anecdote about Simonides. Challenged to express himself about the essence of God, the wise one demands a day for consideration, then still a day and on the following evening still a third day. Asked why he always again postpones his answer, he replies: "The deeper I reflect about God's essence, the more unclear become my ideas" (cited after G. Boissier: La Fin du Paganisme, 7th ed., 1, 272). The exalted thinker Yajnavalkya goes so far that one can state of God neither that he is being, nor also that he is not being: a sentence in which the fact that God is a pure thought-shape (idea) finds perfect expression. Also here offers us Eckhart an exact parallel: "Speak I also: God is a being, it is not true: he is an over-hovering being and an over-being nothingness." (Ed. Pfeiffer, pp. 316–319). And Luther writes: "God is ungraspable and invisible; what one however grasps and can see is not God" (Concordance, under "God"). It is now highly noteworthy that we not alone with our mystics, but with all most outstanding religion-teachers within Christianity meet similar utterances about the unknowability of God: for this proves that the concept God as thought-shape lives further beside the other God-concepts. The Christian Church has namely undertaken to melt three completely different God-ideas – different according to origin and according to essence – with one another into a unity: the personal-historical Jew-God, the mythological-mystical three-unity God of the world-all and the to the man necessary and insofar inborn thought-shape God.

Upon Yahveh, the Jew-God, the possible has been done in order to eradicate all that could even from afar look like an idea; it is a matter of a completely graspable, clear-bounded, historical shape; Yahveh is properly nothing other than an old Jew, equipped with grand will-energy and good spirit-gifts, thereby however angry-mooded and revengeful and in many relations lacking the simplest moral concepts: every deceit, every robbery- and murder-campaign he approves as soon as this benefits his chosen little people or one of his special favourites; he is without every feeling for inborn man-worth and inborn merit. Involuntarily falls one with Yahveh Goethe's Tame Xenion in (Div. 4): As one is, so is his God; Therefore became God so often to mock. From another world stems the actual God of the Christian Church: the idea of a holy three-unity (Trimurti) is old-Aryan good that in the most various shapes everywhere where this metaphysically gifted man-kind is strongly represented again surfaces. In this case the nearer formation of the idea took place under the influence of the late-Hellenic philosophy that had fallen upon theological by-ways and precisely because its flight-force was broken boasted of special inspirations and trusted itself with the impossible. Here it is a matter of the unconditional grand idea of an all-embracing Godhead that – as such – stands outside all time and all history; this God forms not, as the thought-shape of the highest good being, of the Father in heaven, the supplementing opposition to the idea of the man, rather he supplements the idea of the nature. Therefore he needs for the connection with the fleeting race of the mortals a second divine personality, the Redeemer; finally a third represents the element of the commonness between Creator, Redeemer and the man. The said suffices for the proof that between the historical Jew-God and the mythological Christ-God in truth not the most distant analogy exists. Upon this question we will have to come back in a later section; here lay it solely to me to bring preliminary clarity into complicated and with intention dark-held relations, in order now to be able to prove that behind these two since two thousand years much trouble and noise causing God-ideas the third and actual God-idea has still lived further – has lived with the leaders of the religious life, as well as certainly also with millions of simple souls. This third – in truth the very first – God-idea is the actually pure-human, and precisely because of its pure-humanity the pure-divine: here has the man laid less own-will into it, here has he not misused God to the political deus ex machina, as the Hebrew, nor as the Church-fathers a grand God-intuition through endless spinning at the same time man-like restricted and far-removed from the man-heart. Characteristic for this thought-shape is precisely its ungraspability: the man seeks a higher being that surpasses his understanding; if he understood it, so would it not be that which he seeks and of which he so necessarily needs. Where we therefore – as before with the Indians, with Master Eckhart and with Simonides – find the unfathomable, not at all into the forms of our thinking to be banned as the for the essence of God characteristic, can we be sure that we have to do with that idea that as counterpart to the idea Man arises thought-necessarily – as above sufficiently has been set apart. Upon Yahveh is nothing ungraspable, not even something problematic; every Jewish religion-teaching praises as a preference of this faith that it contains no secret, no mysticism, rather is graspable to the commonest understanding down to the ground. With the three-unity it behaves true otherwise; yet has the Church undertaken to establish all concepts concerning the essence of this Godhead hair-sharp, so that, even if no human brain is able to take up and to harbour beside one another those determinations of the Nicene and of the Athanasian Creed, the orthodox one may not assert that the essence of God is unknown and unrecognisable, but at most that it is to him personally not understandable. Precisely the confession that it belongs to the essence of God to be ungraspable to the understanding, find we now, as said, with all outstanding Christians and conclude therefrom that to them – in spite of all ecclesiastical determinations – the unfalsified, pure, original God-feeling in the depths of the heart lives further. Almost would I be tempted here to go nearer into the view of the Apostle Paul, who there confesses: "Fragment is our knowing … Now we see in the mirror only dark outlines" (1 Cor. 13, 9 ff.); and who at another place of the same letter (8, 5) writes the noteworthy words: "May there also be so-called gods, be it in heaven, be it upon earth, – there are yes of the gods many and of the lords many – so there is yet for us only One God, the Father…"

Yet will I in the moment limit myself to this fleeting pointing; for this mighty man demands deeper going-into. Let us grasp out of the fullness of the testimonies some from the Church-fathers and apologetes of the earliest times. Already the great Origen emphasises repeatedly that the man-understanding is unable to grasp God; it will suffice to lead one single place. In his work De Principiis (Book 1, Section 5) he writes: "If I may confess the exact truth, God is ungraspable and can not be known." Cyprian writes (About Idols, Section 9): "God can not be seen – his light blinds the eye; he can not be understood – for he is too pure for our understanding; nor can we measure him – for he surpasses our knowledge-capacity; therefore say we only then something right about him when we confess he is not to be grasped." Similarly means the apologete Minucius Felix (Octavius, Chapter 18): "Our man-heart is too narrowly bounded to understand God; we estimate him only then rightly when we recognise he surpasses every estimation." Hereby is especially noteworthy that Minucius Felix with this assertion does not appeal to the Christian revelation, but expressly to the testimony "of all men." Gregory of Nazianzus warns that the man should not dare to apply any concept-determination to God: "Only through silence may the man-soul revere the truth of the divine essence, which is inexpressible and exalted over every thought and over every possibility of the knowledge" (after Scotus Erigena, Division of the Nature, Book 2, Chapter 28). Such testimonies could certainly still numerous ones be proved; thus writes for example the teacher of Constantine Lactantius, in his writing About the Anger of God (Chapter 11): "God is so great that man-words do not become just to him, nor the senses can reach him." And still one place will I bring forward out of that oldest time of the Christianity, because of its special reference to the kinship between the thought-shapes Man and God. Theophilus writes in his Letter to Autolycus (Chapter 2): "Sayest thou to me, show me thy God, so answer I, show me thine own Self, then will I show thee my God." Later become true such utterances rarer, because the dogmatic reason-building claims the forces ever more and presses back the inborn instincts; yet breaks the original with truly religious natures nevertheless always again through. Thus gives for example Augustine – the actual completer of the concept of the ecclesiastical orthodoxy – in his De Trinitate a description of God, of which some fragments follow here: "He is good, without possessing properties, great, without amount nor number, he rules, without however possessing a location, is all-present, without being at any place, and eternal, although he stands outside the time" (Book 5, Chapter 1, Section 2) – a language that, as one sees, reminds of Eckhart. No wonder if it at a further place (Book 5, Chapter 9) says: "this be said of God, not in the delusion thereby to have said something, but only in order that this subject be not passed over with silence" (non ut aliquid diceretur, sed ne taceretur). Whoever however has become attentive and looks more exactly will frequently with this pillar of the orthodoxy meet utterances that point to the presence of the quiet, inner, unsearchable God, and indeed not alone in the of mysticism over-flowing confessions, but also in his theological writings. Even with the early scholastics we meet assertions like that that God must be named not a Something (quid), but a Nothing (nihil). "God knows not what he himself is, that is he knows not that he is Something, because he recognises that he by no means belongs into the region of that which is somehow known and of which one can say or think what it is" (Scotus Erigena, Division of the Nature, Book 2, Chapter 28). Noteworthy is that both Anselm and Albert the Great assert that only that one can think God as not being who does not recognise himself as man (after J. E. Erdmann, Outline of the History of Philosophy, § 201, 2). Still more must it astonish us when we with a man like Thomas of Aquinas meet an utterance like the following: Magis nobis manifestatur de Deo quid non est quam quid est – clearer is to us in regard to God what he is not than what he is (Quaestiones, De anima, art. 13); a hesitating, with the language not daring forth Yajnavalkya! Ever more lose themselves the scholastics in their special rationalism and counts it to them as honourpoint that all must be reachable to the reason, also the essence of the Godhead, which leads to towerhigh follies. Opposite to them stands however the quiet, never dying-out host of the mystics, from Francis of Assisi in the twelfth century on to Jakob Böhme in the seventeenth and to Blake in the nineteenth century; Master Eckhart is with right the best known; he was already above manifoldly cited, for his God-idea corresponds exactly to the here represented. Finally I add still one single word out of the glorious, by Luther published Theologia Deutsch, because of its agreement with the thought from which we in this chapter went

out: “Speaks the man: see, I poor fool, I meant I was it, now was it and is it truly God.” Since it comes to me here solely upon indications, I spring courageously over to Immanuel Kant and recommend to the attention of my readers his small writing About the Failure of all Philosophical Attempts in the Theodicy, in which Kant stamps the recognition of God’s unsearchability to a moral duty and in this connection ends with a praise-song upon Job, who opposite his Yahveh-believing friends represents this standpoint, for which he – as Kant with biting irony emphasises – “before a synod, an inquisition, a venerable classis or any upper-consistory of our time would have experienced a bad fate.” So clearly recognises the clear thinker that to the pure thought-shape God our churches most gladly grant no home-right! This God – the good being, the man’s Friend, the Father in heaven, who with evil thoughts and deeds friendly-strictly admonishes and with good helps and supports – this God is to me since early youth always present; always was it to me as if I stood upon his open hand-palm and could therefore, whatever also may happen, never fall into the abyss; without this consciousness would I have been unable to live my life. I believe in no possibility of an all-circles grasping mighty and lasting reblooming of religious life until this God – who is not known but believed – becomes anew general possession of the man-souls. Thereto must however the desert-God be banished out of our education: he poisons us from child’s legs on our idea of and our relation to the Godhead. Also the three-unity must be recognised as grand, truth-pregnant mythological symbol, yet not through squeezing into school-formulas and forcing as dogmatic creed of faith made into a torment for brain and heart; such thoughts possess only value and truth as long as they live and move. Besides is well to consider that to the millions of come-down fragment-men (p. 16) of our days with philosophical-theological systems is not at all to be come near, they possess no organ for the taking-up of such thoughts. Here would it come upon it to awaken again the feeling of the man-dignity, which infallibly must lead to a presentiment of the highest good being. What we need is the God of Jesus Christ, the Father in heaven.

II. The Mediator

There exists an invincible opposition between God and man; without mediator is no relation between both possible. (Pascal) In the previous chapter I have tried to make graspable in which way the thought-shape God at all arises: at the most various places of the earth, at the most various times has it arisen and will always again in the consciousness of genial single men out of the described thought-necessity be newly born and from there arrive into the brains of the less gifted. It is this the purely natural, through no fantastic, through no willing, through no historical experience clouded thought-shape of God, that as living spring-point continually breaks through in the depths of our mind. In its purity can we seldom prove it, because almost at once the more colourful life of consciousness-layers that lie nearer the surface overgrows and over-luxuriates it: fear and hope, measureless wishes, through frightful nature-events caused soulshaking, especially the experience of death, the return of the dead in the dream and the from there arising spirit-faith, all sorts of fantastic magic-spook – later then the opener glance out upon the nature and the from there resulting mythological shape-fullness, or with more materialistically disposed peoples the transfiguration of their history-memories to God-willed fables, with others again the highflight of the thinking and the fervour of moral striving, finally – and unfortunately mainly – the measureless ambition of a necessarily to hypocrisy and deceit inclining professional priesthood: all these to the man inborn drives, directions, passions – wise and foolish, weal-bringing and destroying – take possession of the thought-shape God in order to make it in thousand-fold transformations serviceable to their goals. In the histories of the religion known to me finds one about the named relations no word, whereby these works for the question after the content of religion with the various cults suffer severe loss; for for the knowledge of the religious value of a faith-system possesses the description of articles of faith, ceremonies, eternally changing myths etc. relatively small, against that the force and fullness of the invisibly flowing inner stream the very highest meaning. A very colourful “religion” can (as that was the case with the Iranians) harbour a strong faith in the inexpressible God, or else this can (as with the old Egyptians) under the fullness of the outer moments – of the materialistic ideas, of the overluxuriating of the magic, of the worldly motives – in the masses wholly vanish and only still in the heart of single ones form a force. Just so can simpler shaped cults out of poverty at God-feeling or out of richness at God-feeling be simple. In the depths of the mind flows just the religion: only there can it be researched; it is a matter, as we saw (p. 27), of “the upward-striving will of the man”: the more significant the man, the mightier strives his will upward, and the mightier sounds in his heart the voice of the unrecognisable highest good being. Therefore Goethe’s word: “God, when we stand high, is All; stand we low, so is he a supplement of our misery” (Max. and Refl. 813). Perhaps throws one against me that precisely Goethe has beheld God not in the own inward, but outside in the nature, and reminds of the mockery of his Ephesian goldsmith: As if there were a God so in the brain There! behind the man’s foolish forehead, Who is much more glorious than the being, At which we read the breadth of the Godhead. Yet brings the brave goldsmith by no means the poet’s relation to the Godhead exhaustively to expression; for proof suffice the before cited words, out of which goes forth that Goethe knows the connection between the mutually conditioning thought-shapes Man and God, and knows that the one stands to the other in most exact mutual effect (correlation). True speaks Goethe relatively seldom and mostly in mysterious words of this pure God-idea; that lies however in the nature of the matter; of a being that can only through “neti, neti” be designated is not good to speak. Even the God-man Martin Luther confesses: “Yes! who knows what is that which is called God? It is over body, over spirit, over all that one can say, hear and think” (Against the Swarm-Spirits). Nevertheless would I undertake to prove out of almost every life-year of Goethe utterances that witness for the never drying-up consciousness of the in the inward felt God. A letter out of the twenty-fifth life-year (15. 4. 75) brings for example the words: “the dear thing that they call God, or as it is called, cares yet very for me” (whereby to heed is that Goethe takes the word God, as in the old-Nordic, as neuter).

With sixty-five years he distinguishes between the "special religions" that it "seems hard to develop out of the inward of the man," and the "natural religion," of which "we assume that it earlier has sprung in the human mind"; of the latter says he: "to it belongs much tenderness of the disposition." If Goethe can be designated as the great seer of God in the nature, so gains he this capacity precisely out of his intimate faith in the "God in the inward." We learned from Pascal that uniquely who is conscious of God in the soul beholds him outside in the nature (p. 22), and just heard we Goethe's: "God, when we stand high, is All." Therefore is it not paradoxical when I assert: in this mighty intellect is it the God in the inward who recognises the God outside in the nature. So much only for the summarising and supplementing repetition of the in the first chapter gained results. To the thought-shapes Man and God is accustomed with almost equal nature-necessity a third to join itself, that true already stands upon the boundary of the inventing myth and this boundary well always soon oversteps, that however a short consideration in its original purity deserves, since both myth and history become more understandable out of the clear grasping of the simple ground-thought: I speak of the idea of a mediator between man and God. This idea of a mediator, or, if not of an actual mediator, then at least of some mediating action, is over the world widely spread. Become we first conscious of our idea Man as that of a unique cosmic phenomenon, so grows the force of the "upward-striving will" more and more: God becomes ever more urgently needed, yet yields, the stormier our will stretches the hands after him, ever further back: also this must as a nature-necessary fact of our mind be recognised, that is already familiar to us out of other crosswise arising ideas – as freedom and necessity. There now births the longing the idea of a between God and man mediating being: be it that a man-natured one swings himself up to the Godhead, to us others the ways thither preparing; be it that the "highest good being, the Father in heaven" inclines himself down in love and – in some, by the understanding never to be thought-out way – communicates to us of his essence Something – thereby lifting us up to himself. Both ideas – the God-become man and the man-become God – meet we on all sides; in the ground taken equal they one another completely and mean the two possible kinds to shape out the same thought of the mediator. In the midst of the colourful, unthinkable, fantastic, often to madness bordering fullness out of which our "religions" are woven, forms the thought – better said the thought-shape – of the mediator the actual and truly religious kernel, beside which all remaining must only count as accessory –, as a more or less chance accessory, temporally conditioned and in part purely arbitrary, often even immediately unreligious, if not even anti-religious. We do consequently well to grasp three thought-shapes clearly into the eye: the "God-ward looking man" (as the old Chaucer expresses himself), that is that man who is conscious with his essence to reach out over the appearance-world – the God whose presence he divines and whose assistance he experiences –, thereto a between these both mediating force: these three thought-shapes form the content of all religion. Since I intend not to write for scholars, nor am thereto entitled, but only have readers in mind who seek clarity for the furthering of their own soul as I have sought it for mine, so will I not out of ethnographic, anthropological and religion-historical works gather circumstantial material, but content myself therewith to make clear the results of my seeking, thinking and experiencing through single examples shortly – more not. Kant's word about the existence of God, it is "thoroughly needful that one convince oneself thereof, not however just as needful that one demonstrate it" (Unique Motive), holds upon this whole field: as soon as of things is the speech that – in part or wholly – concern a world beyond the world of the appearance, can one never prove, at best convince: may it succeed to me with some! As already remarked above, is the between man and God Mediating not always a personality, rather seems this conception of the mediator to spring from a comparatively higher culture-stage. By far greater spread – almost over all world-parts and times – possesses the idea of a upon material way to be effected mediation of the striven nearer commonness of the man with the Godhead. No achievement of the last fifty years upon religion-historical field possesses greater range and leads deeper into the mysteries of the man-soul than the discovery of the original essence of the sacrifice-thought through W. Robertson Smith, footing upon the works of Mannhardt and soon further pursued by Hubert, Mauss, Frazer and others, who true corrected and clarified many things, but confirmed that discovery itself in all essential points.

To the sacrifice lies not – as one had taught us and as we believed to take it out of the Bible and out of Homer – the idea of a to the Godhead offered gift or tribute underlying, but rather the unequally deeper thought of the meaning of the blood-commonness as a binding and connecting means between the living beings. All still so primal peoples honour the blood-brotherhood; through it is a true kinship with its duties and rights founded: therefore as goal the bringing-about of a bloodbrotherly kinship between man and God. Already however the fact of the common enjoyment of the same food founds a true temporally limited, yet real blood-brotherhood: from which derives itself the age-old meaning of common meals. In order now to the unapproachable God in similar way to come near, to become related to him or about withered relations newly to refresh and a right to divine assistance to gain, is – let us say as example – a to the God and therefore also to the man holy animal – an otherwise unconditionally inviolable – under all sorts of solemnities first consecrated, then slaughtered, a part through burning or in other way to the Godhead for enjoyment offered, the remaining by the sacrificing ones themselves consumed. Through this common enjoyment of the same food arises the right-binding kinship-relation of the sacrificing ones to the Godhead. "By no means is it a matter of the payment of a tribute, rather of the foundation of fellowship-relations between the Godhead and its worshippers," says Robertson Smith (Religion of the Semites, Lecture 6). "The animal-sacrifice has in old times never borne the meaning of a gift to the Godhead, rather was it a matter of the creation of a commonness between the men and their God through the between both divided life of the sacrificed" (there, Lecture 10). Of the faultlessly executed sacrifice testify Hubert and Mauss: It effects "the absolute identification of the sacrifice-bringer, of the sacrificed and of the God" (Le Sacrifice, contained in Mélanges d'histoire des religions, 1909, p. 73). I skip over the thousand-fold transformations and the inexhaustible complications that the human fantasy as well as the greed of the professional priests invented: it suffices me to have peeled out the underlying thought. Upon this way must it come to the man-sacrifice. To the primal men who scarcely knew how to distinguish themselves from the animals with which they believed to stand in near kinship-relations and of which therefore always single races counted as inviolable, fell it not hard to find animals sufficiently holy for the high purpose; in India for example grasped one for the most solemn sacrifice-deeds to the noble horse; also in Greece it occurred that one used snow-white horses as sacrifice-animals. The more the man became conscious of his man-dignity, the more feelably must however the need after a highernatured mediation press itself: what other choice remained then left than that of the God-related man himself? Where one shrank to kill this actually, grasped one to feints and disguises: in certain cases was the relevant youth in the last moment replaced through a substituting animal; at a Greek sacrificefestival was the sacrifice-calf, in order that it count for a man, wrapped in a mantle and set upon cothurni, etc. Hereby remained the always active building invention-gift of the man not standing, rather was it soon the God himself who was sacrificed! One must namely know the following. With all sacrifices was the to-be-sacrificed being (no matter whether animal or plant) from the house out as especially holy and chosen regarded; besides happened the inventible to heighten this property as much as possible, so that Robertson Smith draws the comparison with an electrical accumulator in order to make graspable in which degree the sacrifice in the moment before its death swells and shines of holiness. Therefore counts also the the deadly stroke leading one as murderer and must subject himself to special purifications; there were cases in which he must quickly flee, others in which one appointed criminals to this office and then really executed them; in Greece one loved a sham court-session at which finally the knife was condemned and thrown into the water. Whoever knows these facts will easily grasp that as soon as the man himself was the sacrifice, he hereby alone already almost up to the dignity of a God grew up. One step further, and it was the God in own person; even the Hellenes whose great poets had known so sharply to distinguish between God and man accommodated themselves easily to the idea of the embodiment (incarnation) of a God in a man (O. Gruppe: Greek Myth. and Relig.-Hist., § 307; and see for "the consuming of the Godhead," § 257).

Known is the example of the old Mexico, where yearly a beautiful youth as embodiment of the Godhead upon earth was chosen and a time long treated with all to a God coming honour-expressions, in order at last under great solemnities for the weal of all to be sacrificed; Prescott has in his Conquest of Mexico masterly described this process. Since then has one uncovered similar many places, so that Frazer has been able to dedicate a whole volume to the Dying God. "In this conception of the sacrificed as a divine personality reaches the idea of the sacrifice its highest-possible expression. Under this shape has it penetrated into the most spread religions of the mankind and has there produced articles of faith and religion-customs that still today live" (Hubert and Mauss, p. 103). A wide way has, as one sees, the sacrifice-thought laid back, from beginnings on that to us of today almost ungraspable, childish-fantastic seem, up to ideas to which one cannot deny a shuddering exaltedness. Whoever hereby longer dwells will learn much about the inborn peculiarities of the man-mind, especially about the persistent sticking to the matter, also with bold soul-flight and tenderly woven thoughts. High-standing men – men to whom the confession was common: "God is Spirit" (John 4, 24) – could on the long run with these ideas of the mediating sacrifice find no satisfaction: the mediator between spirit and spirit – it was not otherwise possible – must likewise be spirit, his working a spiritual, and that means, a working not upon the body, but upon spirit and mind, thus through word and deed. So would we again have arrived at the mediator, who is either a divine messenger – perhaps God himself who sinks himself down to us earthly ones, and indeed, in order that he make himself understandable to us, in human shape – or a man who thanks to high and holy gifts reaches near to the by us divined higher being. Both ideas of the mediator meet we in their purity with the Aryan Indians. According to the teaching of the so-called Avataras or divine reincarnations (from ava-tar, down-step) embodies the one-God from time to time and enters in man-shape the world, in order here to set a goal to the overhand-taking of the bad and to help up the suppressed virtue. In that unique poem, the Bhagavadgita, speaks the upon earth under the name Krishna wandering God to the hero Arjuna, whom he guides and fires to death-contempt and high sense: As the weakening of the right begins each time here, o Bharata, And the arising of the unright, so create I myself again. To the protection of the pious-minded, to the godless' downfall, To the eternal right's firming arise I new from time to time [Footnote: Song 4, double-verse 7, 8, after the translation of Wilhelm von Humboldt in his wonderful work about the Bhagavadgita, Works 5, 208. Since the understanding of the two first verses falls perhaps hard to the unprepared reader, I add here Garbe's prose-translation: "For each time when the right is in the decreasing, o descendant of the Bharata, and the unright in the increasing, then create I myself (as man). To the protection of the good and to the destruction of the bad, in order to firm the right am I born in every man-age."].

A number of other embodiments of the God upon earth are familiar to the Indian thinking and inventing, whereby well to remark is that it is not as in the Greek mythology a matter of gods who for the furthering of their mutual intrigues temporarily step down upon the earth and mix themselves into the human events, but always of the one-God who, thought as moral all-power, hurries to the help of the virtuous against the over-power of the bad. The other conception of the mediator meets us likewise nowhere upon the world so unambiguous clear as with these same Indians: a man at whose historical existence after the newest researches cannot be doubted, a prince in the bloom of the youth and of the well-being, leaves throne, wife and children in order as beggar to wander through the homeland and to loosen the men from the world with its cares and lying promises and to lead them God-ward: an apparently mad undertaking that however for many hundred millions became the starting-point to a higher religion-life. Here will one throw against me that Buddha has at all believed in no God. Yet lies the matter not so simple; it lets itself without some knowledge of the abyss-depth of Indian thinking not make clear. One heed that Buddha himself harbours the faith in a personified power of the bad – thus in a highest bad being – Mara, the prince of the death: as the shadow irrefutably proves the existence of the light, just so witnesses this Satan for the existence of a highest good being. That finds further confirmation through the following fact: a monk who had taught that that man who dies without sins falls to the final annihilation and finds himself (as the Indians express themselves) "neither this side nor beyond the death," was as heretic corrected. (Oldenberg: Buddha, 2nd ed., p. 303.)

About the beyond lets itself just for the deeper thinking one with the understanding nothing state; there rules the "neti, neti," which we earlier in regard to God learned (p. 28); since also time and space there no more hold, so "extinguishes" (Nirvana) the entire world of the appearance – whereby however by no means is said that not another world opens itself. With every movement can one distinguish two opposed points: from the one removes one himself, toward the other strives one; with the "upward-striving will of the man toward God," fetters the former – namely the point from which one removes himself (the man) – almost alone Buddha's glance, the second (God) hovers to him in misty distance. The dignity of the man stands to him so high – and that is genuine Aryan at his conception – that to him at our earth-life all appears miserable-insufficient. His whole persuasion-power he dedicates to the one goal to convince the through apparent-goods beguiled men hereof, so that they to all earthly determinedly and finally turn the back. As soon as the new direction is struck, leads it inescapably the new way; this suffices, and Buddha scorns it to make words about the affirming side of his undertaking – words that yet only figuratively and therefore also sensuously could fall out, since every picture must attach to known appearances. Such abstinence – one think only as counter-picture of the paradise of the Mohammedans – witnesses of greatness and purity. In these both ideals of the mediator (God-man and man-God) behold we a noteworthy connection of deep-sense and childlikeness. All the traditions in which the embodied God upon earth appears belong to the most exalted that the human inventing possesses; against that works it almost confusing when one sees how little the All-mighty with all his efforts achieves; the men remain incorrigible, and the God must always anew down to the earth. With Buddha again works his life – the into the deed converted turning-away from the world – unconditionally grand and forms unquestionably the source of his enormous effect; against that lies naivety in the limitation of the thinking to the one straight, consistent line which with necessity issues into the empty.

Nevertheless remains it also for us of today of decisive value to possess these both in their simplicity purest ideas of the mediator, which so thoroughly stand off from those that surround us Europeans since childhood. Through the Hellenic-Roman foundation of our entire culture and thereby at the same time of our education and of our idea-world is to us an unentangleable colourful mass of middle-beings between man and God handed over – from Olympic "gods" on, that are properly consciously invented representatives of the in the background ruling nameless "highest being," up to deified folk-heroes, to Syrian nature-demons, Persian angels, Egyptian "death-gods," late-Platonic demiurges, aeons etc. etc. It cannot belong to the tasks of the present book to shine into this impenetrable mass; rather content I myself to say some little about a pair of shapes in which one perceives clear traces of the thought-shape of a mediator and at whose during many centuries never extinguishing and always anew flame-like flaring-up reverence and worship one clearly recognises the living need of the man-heart after mediation. It is not so fantastic as it may appear to many in the first moment when I in this connection point to the shape of the Heracles, of the most popular of all heroes that sprang from the Greek fantasy and in which much deep-sense lies hidden. True falls it not easy to find oneself right in the over-fullness; for from all sides was unceasingly carried thereto what only every landscape of over-measure manachievements knew to report, and also about the origins have poets and scholars dozens of explanations at hand which reach from the interpretation as a pure sun-myth up to the assertion that a definite prehistorical man has through his over-towering deeds given the impulse to all later inventions. I mean however we go not wrong when we simplify in the way that we here above all behold a testimony for the unstillable longing of the "upward-striving will" after God-related man-hood – at body strong and beautiful, at mind childlike and unselfish. The second begets not Gaia again; Not leads him Hebe into the heaven; In vain toil the songs, In vain torment they the stone. And when it at the same place of the classical Walpurgis-night says: There saw I before eyes stand, What all men divine praise – so reminds that us that Heracles also with the "God-Son" of the Phoenicians was identified, the wise, strong God who wanders upon earth, everywhere weal creating (compare Daremberg et Saglio: Dict. des Antiq. 3, 79). Very noteworthy is also the word of Richard Wagner who of Heracles says: "Here was the true man first born" (Art and Climate); as we know is the thought-shape God first grasped by the true man: thereafter would we have in the half-mythical Heracles to revere the mediator of the Godthought. Similar stands it about Asclepius – a to us newer ones less familiar, between man and God hovering shape that in the antiquity enjoyed highest and most general regard as the epitome, not so much

of the strong as of the exceedingly wise, kind helper in all needs and pains, of whom it remained questionable whether here a God temporarily has dwelled upon earth or a man through his "upwardstriving will" has been raised to the Godhead. In religious relation a far greater, through millennia reaching meaning possessed Osiris. Earnest present researchers are of the conviction that the to this name attaching sagas go back to a historical personality, to a man who has really lived, and indeed as benefactor of whole Egypt, whose astonishingly durable order he created, to whose culture, riches, peaceful development and perhaps also religion he laid the foundations, namely to a king out of the first dynasty who millennia before Christ's birth dwelled under the living (Maspero, Budge and others). This great man grew soon to mythical shape, at the same time – if I may so express myself – grew he into his own religion. He received the to us out of the first chapter known honour-name: "the good being"; he was true not equated to the great All-God, was however called "Lord of the eternity and ruler of the dead"; for Osiris who as man had done so infinitely much good for the mortals received now in the beyond the office of a strict, the noble-striving part of the mankind faithfully protecting friend; as mild judge ruled he at the gates of the paradise. Upon earth was he – so narrated the saga – by his own brother, the spirit of the bad, killed, his corpse torn and the pieces far around strewn; when however after toilsome years his wife Isis had succeeded to find all pieces and to put together, the All-God animated him anew – true no more to the earthly existence, yet to the immortality in the beyond. Here now lay the true spring-point of all Egyptian religiosity that otherwise under the learned theological waste of the priest-schools would have been stifled. One of the first researchers of our day writes: "For the faith of the Egyptians possesses the cruel death and the blessed resurrection of Osiris the same meaning as the death and the resurrection of Christ for the faith of the Christians. As Osiris died and from the dead again arose, just so hoped each one through his mediation and through the calling upon his dear name to awake victoriously out of the death-sleep toward a blessed eternity. In the life's storms was this the anchor to which the men held themselves fast; this hope has comforted and upheld millions of Egyptian men and women during a time that spans far more centuries than since the founding of the Christianity until today have elapsed. In the long history of the religion there are not two divine shapes that in regard to the fervour of the devotion and to the exuberance of the hopes that they have kindled stand so near as Osiris and Christ" (Frazer: Osiris, Chapter 11). The shapes themselves – the great Egyptian statesman, and Jesus of Nazareth, the Galilean carpenter's son, whose "kingdom is not of this world" – show not the least kinship; also to their violent death comes by no means a similar meaning. Wherein consists thus the by Frazer asserted "nearness"? Solely in the immeasurable religious meaning of a mediator between man and God. To the mere unsupplemented thought of God dwells no decisive religious meaning: it awakens knowledge and presentiment, is also suited – as we saw that with the primal men – to enliven and to strengthen moral stirrings; yet to the true elevation, to that turning of the will-direction out of earthly confinement to new, higher hoping and accomplishing belongs the co-operation of an allovertowering force: the force of the mediator. As opposition to the religion of Osiris, at the same time for further clarification of the meaning of the idea of a mediator, I point to the religion of Mithras, which in the last centuries of the Roman emperorempire gained great spread and a time long seemed determined to strike the Christianity out of the field. Here is – first – of a mediator not the speech. Mithras is simply the All-God, revered in the shape of the crowning work of his creation: the sun. The value of this religion – and it is a high one – rests upon its pure Aryan origin, which true through all sorts of Semitic and people-chaotic additions was clouded and covered over, yet possessed too much life and force ever to lose the stamp of the Aryan. "Perfect purity" was the goal to which the existence of the believer should strive: this perfect purity distinguishes the Persian mysteries from those of all other oriental gods (Franz Cumont: The Oriental Religions, German by Gehrich, p. 184). "No religion of the world was ever so fanatically devoted to the purity-ideal as this" – says Farnell of the Persian primal-religion out of which that of Mithras stems (The Evolution of Religion, p. 127). The latter characterises now besides the purity the with it interwoven extraordinarily strong emphasis of the deed; the awakening of all dispositions to energy in order to fetch out of every man the highest-achievement forms its main care, it embodies as it were Goethe's admonition "Think to live!": so became the religion of Mithras the religion of the military legions and has hereby gained an immeasurable influence upon the stock of the Roman empire, in that thanks to this blessing influence at a time of the general morals-decay the army remained pure and strong. It is certainly no chance if the most ruins of the devotion-places of this God-idea today upon German soil are found: the religion of Mithras said to our Germanic forefathers.

Thorough attention deserves the fact that also this faith on the long run of the mediator has not been able to do without. True are we, in spite of the admirable works of the Belgian scholar Cumont, still little informed about the details of the teachings of this Mithras-religion – so conscientiously strict was the command of the silence kept, yet has Albrecht Dieterich's discovery of fragments of a Mithrasliturgy brought some to the day-light, thereunder especially the fact that within the Godhead between Father and Son was distinguished: both formed a unique being in unio mystica united, yet distinguishable: Mithras, the Father, Helios, the Son. The office of the Son is it to mediate between the man and his Father in heaven (compare A Mithras-Liturgy, 1903, pp. 68, 135). By old Christian apologetes has been asserted that this God-teaching stems from a later time as after-formation of halfunderstood Christian articles of faith; the judgment of the Church-fathers is however little to trust; here break probably age-old, carefully secret-kept teachings through; thus hear we for example of the Chaldaean Nebuchadnezzar the Great, who refused to none of the numerous gods of the Babylonian pantheon the public reverence, that "if not in the theory, yet in the practice Marduk (the main-god) was his own, unique God, and he revered Nabu as his Son and revelation" (Tiele, Hist. of the Religion in Antiquity, German by Gehrich, 1, 202). To us can the decision leave indifferent; for it suffices us to know that also this great religion of the mediator has not been able to do without. And indeed stood the mediator to the believing day and night by: "He protected them in their uninterrupted fight against the powers of the darkness; he helped them to remain true to the truthfulness, to practise justice and to preserve the purity… and after the death led he the souls over to the fields of the blessed" (Cumont in Daremberg 3, 1953). Still remains a religion to mention, for us Christians well the most meaningful – that of Dionysus. In the school was one accustomed to teach us: the fact that Dionysus only once in the Iliad is named (VI, 132 ff.), and indeed fleetingly and not very honourably, suffices for the proof that it is a matter of a then newly appearing shape, still scarcely taken up under the gods and probably from outside introduced; a conception that was supplemented through the instruction that the Dionysian cult forms in the Greek life an earlier unknown appearance that initiates the decay. In reality stems precisely Dionysus – that is today admitted by all specialist scholars – out of the very earliest times of which we possess knowledge, and is considerably older than the whole Homeric and pre-Homeric Olympus.

Dionysus is namely identical with the God Agni-Soma who already in the oldest parts of the Rigveda is revered. Not alone forms here as there the relation to bodily and also to soul-intoxication and exuberance the leading trait of the mythical shape – a trait that determines into soul-depths all the characteristic; but even traits that first make the impression of quite arbitrary invention-fantasy agree with both exactly: just so for example as the to the birth unfinished Dionysus is taken by Zeus out of the dead mother-womb and sewn into the own thigh for the ripening, just so proceeds Indra with Soma – wherefore the Indian God received the by-name of the "twice-born," exactly corresponding to the Greek by-name of Dionysus, Dithyrambus. Both gods die, and both stand mightier than before again up; above all: both gain manifoldly the meaning of mediators between man and God. This out of the most age-old times of a pure Aryan-hood stemming religion of Dionysus permeates, as we now know, all stages of the Hellenic culture, from the primal-beginnings on up far into the Christianity; the names have often changed, yet recognised the Greeks for example in the Zagreus of the Cretans and in the Sabazius of the Thracians – to name only the two most significant – at once their familiar, at the same time cheerfully exuberant and deep-sense mysterious God again, who at all times was and remained their actual religion-God. One knows for example that in Delphi Apollo first was felt as intruder and he owed his later ruling position solely to the melting with Dionysus. True led the to all mythologies common lust to eternally changing relations, exchanges, assimilations also here to many a darkening and misleading – so especially the drawing-in of the in Syria and Asia Minor favoured vegetation- and season-gods Attis and Adonis, whereby many places the Dionysus-reverence fell upon doubtful byways. Attis and Adonis vanish – as Demeter – yearly at a definite time, namely at the falling-asleep of the vegetation, and return in the following spring with its awakening; also for Dionysus is it characteristic that he sometimes dwells in the midst of his by joy-frenzy ensouled worshippers and then again vanishes from the earth-surface: with him however behaves it otherwise.

"In this vanishing and returning of the God, as it is usual to see allegorical embodiment of the annihilation and restoration of the vegetation, consists no occasion," teaches us Rohde and adds ironically, "except in the once for all fixed axioms of the teaching of the Greek nature-religion" (Psyche 2, 12 ff.). Dionysus remains yes two years long distant, which alone suffices for the proof that here deeper ideas rule. Dionysus is "Lord of the souls and spirits"; he is revered as "King of the dead," as "God of the dead," and – what still more will say – as "Conqueror of the death," as the God who precisely by means of the otherwise feared death rescues the souls of the believers over into the immortality, wherefore he also bears the name Dionysus Soter, that is "the Redeemer" (see Daremberg under "Bacchus"). Also here – as soon as the idea of the mediator demands after last clarity – takes place the splitting of the one-God into Father and Son and leads sometimes over to the concept of the three-unity (Trigonos), – for which we possess the testimony of Augustine. If one adds that to the educated confessors of this faith (namely to the Orphic brotherhoods) the teaching of the sin-fall as well as that of the Logos was not foreign and that they preached chastity and turning-away from this world with fervour, so does one certainly not exaggerate when one estimates them as path-finders for many foundational religion-thoughts of the Christian Church. It could still more confessions be enumerated, yet write I no religion-history, but will only show the ways which the European mankind in its rising longing after mediation was led. So fundamentally different these confessions also were, we find nevertheless with them all peculiarly near-related traits, and indeed precisely there where it holds to strike the bridge between man and God. With all longing after God found the confessors of these various religions always themselves referred upon themselves, and thus referred back upon themselves, – upon the own fantasy, upon the own brooding, upon the own delusion; for an actual mediator, one whom one had seen with eyes and heard with ears, was not present: true should Osiris once have lived, yet solely as an able statesman, and in the course of the millennia was anyway his true shape under the adventurous fantasies of the priests buried and vanished; Dionysus was the last echo of age-old, long-forgotten inventing; the most around him represented allegorical, at best symbolic shapes and led thus always again in the last end back upon the nature, not toward the longed-for God. Under the pressure of the unstillable longing developed themselves now in the man-inward three drives that always more force in him and over him gained – all three as sure ways to the mediation between man and God: the mysticism, the magic, the faith. In one relation form mysticism and magic opposed, each other fleeing end-points, in another flow they into one another; at best is it that one presents these three drives to oneself as if they stood together in a circle-line, so that each of the three borders upon the both others, after each side exercising influence and from each side receiving influence, each of the three however in its actual essence from the others thoroughly different. The mysticism means the striving of the man out of own forces to arrive to God and to cling to him; the magic attaches to oldest ideas of the primal men that we above at the discussion of the original sense of the sacrifice-actions learned, and assumes there are means and ways to force a commonness with God; as faith designate we the forceful rest of a soul which lives of the conviction that God has mercy upon its inability and takes himself of it in love. Let us dedicate to each of these three drives a short consideration. We of today are accustomed with the word mysticism to think of men like Eckhart and Böhme, like Francis and Hafiz – men with whom the pure contemplativeness or the innocent-deed-forceful immersion into a dreamed world predominates; we are accustomed thereby to overlook that no such striving can be exclusively spiritual of kind, rather every one encloses as unavoidable constituent the overcoming of the corporality, which easily leads to wondrous over-strainednesses and dangerous excesses: this negation of the body is for all mysticism characteristic. The Aryan Indians combated the body in that they with iron strictness educated it to rest and motionlessness; hereto belong also their breath-exercises that pursued the purpose to suppress the breathing if possible wholly, whereby at last long-lasting unconsciousness was generated that counted as rapture. Later strove Christian mystics to the same goal through asceticism and bloody self-chastisement.

Further spread was and is however over the whole earth the reverse procedure: to become master of the body through whirling motion, setting it into complete exhaustion and at the same time into ecstasy. Even to the sober Mohammedanism has it never succeeded to banish this form of the mysticism out of its midst: the man's longing to melt with God is an invincible one. The peculiarity of the out of numerous descriptions in their outer course all-known Dionysian and Bacchic festivals of the frenzy and of the intoxication grasps one first when one has grasped that it is by no means a matter of showing reverence to a wild Godhead, rather of gaining the union with a mild, man-friendly God: this is mysticism. Upon the famous vase of the museum at Naples approaches to Dionysus from the one side the train of the drunken Bacchantes, upon the other side stand in solemn earnest immersion shapes that point to divine mysteries: the knowledge of these mysteries forms the end-goal of that intoxication. In order to go sure will I again appeal to a of all fantastic unsuspected witness – to Erwin Rohde. This one writes: "The participants at these dance-festivals set themselves themselves into a kind of mania, an enormous over-straining of their essence; an ecstasy seized them in which they raging, possessed, appeared to themselves and to others. This over-irritation of the feeling up to visionary states effected, with for this receptive ones, the raging dance-whirl, the music, the dark, all the arrangements of this excitement-cult. This outermost excitation was the purpose that one wished to reach. A religious sense had the forcibly brought-about heightening of the feeling therein that only through such over-straining and expanding of his essence the man seemed to be able to step into connection and touch with beings of a higher order, with the God and his spirit-hosts. The God is invisibly present under his inspired worshippers, or he is yet near, and the noise of the festival serves to draw the approaching one wholly near" (Psyche, 2, 11 ff.). So find we then within those between man and God to mediate seeking strivings that we summarise under the name mysticism and that actually form an organic unity, an extended stage-ladder, from drunken orgies on up to that motionless immersion which Fénelon in his Placitis sanctorum praises as the pura contemplatio absque activitate et sollicitudine and which was already known to the Orphic brotherhoods that cultivated a refined, transfigured Dionysus-cult: the purpose is always the elevation up to the Godhead through the heightening into the enormous of forces that slumber in the man-inward. If the men thought consistently, would the ground-thought of all mysticism with the ideas that underlie the magic and the faith never be able to be united; this do they however not, and so drove then especially the magic in the centuries before and after the birth of Jesus Christ the most luxuriant blossoms, and indeed not as opponent of the mysticism, rather in bond with it. If one names – as that is accustomed to happen – the magic a use of supernatural forces, so goes one, I believe, past the leaping point; the actual presupposition forms here the assumption that the nature contains to every still so boldly dreamed effect a sufficient means: it comes only upon it to know this means, to grasp it and rightly to handle it. Supernatural there is with this world-conception at all not; the completely wise one would be able everything. Magic is an after-image of the science; it contradicts all that deserves to be called faith, and beside it prove themselves the efforts of the mysticism as superfluous; nevertheless were neither mysticism nor faith at any time able to renounce it. On the one side is the completely ununderstandable that which to the mass best suits: that and with the hand thrown arrow, if it only is thrown in the right direction, will wound the hundred kilometres distant enemy – this seems to every primal man without further enlightening, and still of today's day doubt many not that if they procure a wax-figure that is to represent their death-enemy, and then pierce this figure with a glowing needle, the enemy must miserably die – if it does not happen, so has something been failed at the procedure. Still never has the card-laying and other such mischief so strongly luxuriated as in the England and France of the present day. It comes however still something thereto. We see also the finest and the strongest spirits indulge a more or less over-painted magic-faith and conclude therefrom upon an invincible need of the man-mind. In this book have we it only with the one idea of a magical effect to do that we already at the beginning of the chapter at the discussion of the original sacrifice-thought learned: through the enjoyment of a sanctified food is the kinship between the participants and God established and hereby at the same time God obligated to stand by the relevant men in their needs.

In the further course of the development seems this original thought to have been pressed into the background in favour of more rationalistic ideas of gift-, thanks-, penance-, repentance-sacrifices and the like more. In Homer for example finds itself to my knowledge no trace of a pointing upon the magical meaning of the sacrifice. Then entered a mighty counter-effect that we are entitled to regard as sprung out of the religious needs of the manheart; on all sides broke the movement at once forth and seized the entire Hellenic and more or less Hellenised world: all wished toward God, wished to melt with him – whereby to heed is that for the Greeks immortal-being means so much as God-being, and a man whose soul has won immortality is insofar to regard equal to God. "The union of the man with the Godhead is the unique and highest goal of all mysteries," witnesses Albrecht Dieterich (A Mithras-Liturgy, p. 209), and Ramsay writes: "The promise to the to-be-initiated sounded: 'Blessed and blessed one, thou shalt become God instead of being mortal.' Becoming-one with the Godhead became the goal of the man-life, a goal that – as many gravestones show – was thought reached at the blessed departing, if not even already in life-times as success of the solemn initiation" (Ramsay: The Teaching of Paul, p. 293). Just so became the thought common good that God at opportunity becomes man. As Jane Harrison executes, these two conceptions call one another forth as supplement, only that the one cult emphasises more the God-becoming of the man, the other the man-becoming of the God (Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, p. 475). "A God who dies and rises, who has gone down to the death-realm and again ascended to heaven …. stands in almost all mystical cults of the late antiquity … in the middle-point of the faith," instructs us Dieterich in his Mithras-Liturgy (p. 173). The concept of a God-man (Theios Anthropos) became so familiar that one many places believed to behold him and testified to wonder-working saints, as to the Apollonius of Tyana and the Alexander of Abonoteichos, divine reverence (Reitzenstein: The Hellenistic Religions, p. 12). Even the Stoic philosopher Epictetus – of whom one would not expect such a turn – writes: "Each of us may designate himself as Son of God" (compare Hatch: Influence of Greek Ideas, p. 155), and the Church-father Athanasius still dares the words: "Jesus Christ became man in order that we men become gods" (cited in Caird: Evolution of Theology, 2, 366), – words that a thousand years later find the echo with Eckhart: "God loves the man not as creature, but as God." Out of these few pointings may the reader take how generally spread the longing after deification of the man then was. This great purpose of the deification formed – as we saw – the goal of all mysticism, both of the materialistic as of the idealistic; yet demanded both directions a greate devotion than is agreeable to most men: of the participants at the Bacchic festivals will it have succeeded only to a minority to reach beyond the body-intoxication up into the desired soul-ecstasy of the God-experience; still fewer will it have been able upon the way of the pure immersion into the inward. Then entered the magic that makes it easy to each: the age-old idea of the effect of a special feeding lived again up and found quickly such a spread that soon this one trait was common to all various religions: the holy meal, the "eating of the God." "That the man can unite himself with a God thereby that he eats him or pieces of him, proves itself always again as age-old, out of the depth of most original religious view upward-pressing faith. As the wild one believes to attain the forces of the wild animal, to make the cleverness and magicpower of the white man his own when he eats of him, so gains he divine force and power when he eats Divine" (Dieterich: Mithras-Liturgy, p. 100). The gaining of this divine feeding lets itself easily present: in the first part of this chapter heard we that it suffices to choose a for the sacrifice suited being that then through further consecrations can reach every degree of holiness (p. 45); upon this way must it succeed to equal the sacrifice completely to the divine essence.

Here is the place to direct the attention upon a strange circumstance. Knownly has Goethe repeatedly declared that his brain possesses no organ for the taking-up of the thought of the transformation (transubstantiation); what prepared to this mightiest understanding invincible difficulty, that has the overwhelming majority of the men at all times without all thought-torment accepted, – the spiritual alchemy shone and shines still today to reasonable and unreasonable without further. We have in this thought to recognise one of the oldest possessions of the mankind whose age lends it honourableness. The form of the sacrifice changed according to the cult.

With the one for example must the blood of the sacrifice-animal flow down over the to-be-initiated; yet remained such barbaric custom relatively isolated, and always more became customary the replacement of the slaughter-sacrifice through the bloodless sacrifice; as soon as the thought of the transformation had become newly familiar, stood to this procedure nothing more in the way: bread and wine were accustomed to represent the God's flesh and blood. Solemn meals with sacramental meaning (love-meals) were an age-old custom of the Aryan peoples and find themselves for example in the pre-Etruscan Latium (Fowler: Roman Ideas of Deity, p. 37); also reaches the assumption of a mysterious kinship between wine and blood very far back (Kircher: The Sacred Meaning of the Wine in Antiquity). As interesting curiosity be mentioned that the host already in old Mexico was known. In short, all elements stood already long ready; it needed only the last thought-spark to come thereto, and the mediation of the divine feeding, of the God-becoming and hereby of the immortality was all places easy to effect. Soon gave it in all mystery-cults "without exception" – says Ramsay in his Religion of Greece – the breaking and distributing of the bread and the drinking out of the common cup. Behold we thus upon pictorial representations of the Mithras-Godservice the believers solemnly assembled around a table upon which bread and wine-cup stand, and see we sometimes Mithras and Helios joined to them, so know we exactly what this has to mean. Here can we now not avoid to point upon the Christianity and its sacrament of the evening-meal; for precisely at this point stands the religion-teaching of the Christian Church in most intimate connection with preceding and surrounding religious ideas and customs. One understands what Heitmüller means when he writes: "This age-old concrete-sensual idea (of the consuming of the Godhead) comes in the early-Christian Lord-meal, upon the highest development-stage of the religion, again to the breakthrough and gains under a new form new life. Precisely thereby received the Christian mystery the character of a much more intimate, more mysterious communion than the most simultaneous heathen and Jewish sacrifice-meals and mysteries. It is a highly peculiar and interesting, by no means however alone-standing appearance: out of the lowest depths of the great stream of the folk- or mankind-religion rises, in a in the single for us unexplainable way, a piece of primitive, concrete religious feeling and presenting to the surface, penetrates up to the in the Christianity reached highest stage of the piety and mysticism, the age-old thought of the union with the Godhead through eating and drinking" (Baptism and Evening-Meal with Paul, p. 48 ff.). To which heights the man-spirit from the foundation of such magical ideas out still should swing itself up, know we; the transformation became finally an in the inward of the spirit completing process; as it in the Anglican catechism of the sacrament says: "an outer and visible sign of an inner and spiritual grace," whereby well-considered the field of the magic is left for that of the faith. Nevertheless remains it of decisive importance to know that the earliest Christianity still wholly naively materialistically grasped this foundation, and indeed in double form: on the one side in attachment to the spread love-meals as memory-meal, on the other side, in exact attachment to the holy God-feeding of the mystery religions. For both find we already with the Apostle Paul the proofs: the Saviour lets he at the institution say: "This do to my memory"; on the other side lives Paul so wholly in the thoughts of his time that he expressly says who participates at the meals of the mystery-religions "comes into the commonness of the demons" (1 Cor. 10, 20), – he believes thus, as one sees, in the magical effect with all its presuppositions and conclusions not alone at the Christian evening-meal, but also at the already earlier existing meals of the Dionysian and other communities! Again lead I Heitmüller: "Taken out of its isolation, appears the Pauline view of the evening-meal in its ground-traits not as an absolute novelty and as an original creation of the Christianity, but as interwoven with the pre- and extra-Christian religious thought-world. It is a new shoot at an old branch of the religion-historical tree of the mankind" (p. 51) [Footnote: I hold it for my duty to make the reader attentive that there are significant specialist scholars who are of other opinion in regard to the relation of Paul to the evening-meal, and refer especially to Carl Clemen's Religion-historical Explanation of the New Testament.]. The both conceptions of Paul meet we also in the oldest communities.

After the Didache (or Teaching of the twelve Apostles) – the oldest known liturgical writing, out of the beginning of the second century – speaks the community at the cup: "We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine-stock of David, thy servant, which thou hast made known to us through thy servant Jesus. To thee be honour in eternity!"

And at the bread speaks it: "We thank thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge that thou hast made known to us through Jesus, thy servant. To thee be honour in eternity!" Thereupon feed the members of the community "until they have satiated themselves" (compare Hennecke: New-Testament Apocrypha, p. 191); as one sees, is it a matter of a solemn meal (called Agape), at which however of a transformation of the bread and of the wine into body and blood of Christ is not the speech. Exactly at the same time – about the year 110 – writes however the martyr Ignatius in his letter to the Ephesians (Section 20) of "the bread which is a magic-means of the immortality (pharmakon athanasias)": he represents thus with all determinateness the magical conception of the sacrament. For this could still many proofs be brought. Above all however must be remarked that the early community just as little as Paul felt a contradiction between the both conceptions; rather arose soon the custom to unite love-meal and sacrifice-meal, in that the enjoyment of the divine flesh and blood was added to the Agape as crowning (compare for example Lightfoot: Ignatius & Polycarp, 2nd ed., 2, 313). Yet has the beautiful love- and memory-meal not long been able to assert itself beside the weight of the age-old magical union-thought; the latter remained alone back, and in place of the satiating bread entered the symbolic wafer. Finally, after a millennium of almost uninterrupted fights between idealistic and materialistic interpretation of the essence of the evening-meal established the Church in the year 1215 in the Lateran-council as dogma: "There is only one general Church of the believers and outside its region becomes thoroughly nobody blessed; in it is priest and sacrifice at the same time Jesus Christ, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar in the shape (sub speciebus) of bread and wine are truly contained, after through God's all-power the bread into the body and the wine into the blood is transformed (transsubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem), so that, in order to complete the mystery of the union, we take of the His what he has taken of the Ours" (cited after Krüger: The Dogma of the Three-Unity and God-Manhood, p. 258 ff.).

This can be called the dogmatic middlepoint of the Catholic Church, for here roots the boundless power of the priesthood; for the knowledge of the man-spirit is noteworthy that the foundation – as one sees – immediately attaches to oldest ideas of the still wholly uncultivated man. The magic – let us say in German the sorcery – and with it the sorcerer had conquered! Of the faith to speak is insofar doubtful as this word in all languages suffers at a peculiar ambiguity. Whoever wishes to be exactly informed hereabout, to him recommend I the treatise of the extraordinary scholar, Bishop Lightfoot, contained in his Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatians (p. 154 ff.). Everywhere shimmers "faith" over into the meaning of the doubting, as a kind of opposition to the knowledge. Besides must we distinguish between a passive meaning, at which the word only says so much that one relies upon someone or upon something or means to be able to rely, and an active meaning, after which the faith means a movement of the mind toward an object that it grasps and holds fast, "the force which drives the man God-ward" (Ramsay: Paul's Teaching, p. 273). Into the two languages of the early-Christian Church – the Greek and the Latin – was a new confusion carried in through the fact that the Hebrew language, to which as language of the Old Testament decisive meaning comes, for the "active" faith at all possesses no word, rather uniquely knows the "passive" faith: a doubtful circumstance for the proclamation of a new religion whose most outstanding peculiarity consists precisely in the emphasis of the active faith, so that already Paul not seldom instead of "proclaim gospel" shortly writes "proclaim the faith" (for example Gal. 1, 23), and that the Christopponent Celsus can raise the reproach that the Christians avoid every proof-leading and teach: "investigate not, but believe! the faith suffices for the redemption!" (see Origen: Contra Celsum 1, 9). I am now of the opinion that for us unlearned the following simplifying consideration leads to a clear and thoroughly sufficient result.

Faith, in the sense of holding-for-true, is everywhere present and lacks just as little to the drunken mystic who seeks the melting with Dionysus as to the participant at a divine sacrifice-meal – both must harbour certain convictions (must thus "believe"), otherwise would their actions be senseless: this name we the passive faith, for it prepares only the way for another deed of the believer, which other deed first effects the redemption. The active faith against that – the faith as Jesus Christ reveals it and as Paul, Augustine and Luther preach it – means a turn of the whole essence, a so decisive process that it possesses the force to bring about the redemption out of earthly bonds to higher life immediately. So hard, yes impossible, it proves itself to determine the concept with words: there is yet a fact at which one can surely recognise whether of "active" faith is spoken or not: always accompanies, as supplementing counterpart, the "active" faith the grace: as the faith strives upward, so strives the grace downward. Faith in this sense taken is nothing other than the love of God in the man-heart mirrored. "Faith is not the human delusion and dream that some hold for faith," says Luther, "Faith is a divine work in us that changes us and new-births us out of God, and kills the old Adam, makes us wholly other men of heart, courage, sense, and all forces, and brings the holy Spirit with itself. O, it is a living, busy, active, mighty thing about the faith, that it is impossible that it should not without cease work good. It asks also not whether good works are to be done, but before one asks, has it done them, and is always in the doing… Faith is a living, daring confidence upon God's grace, so certain that he would die a thousand times over it,… And such confidence and knowledge of divine grace makes joyful, defiant and lusty toward God and all creatures, which the holy Spirit does in the faith" (Preface upon the Ep. of Paul to the Romans). At the same place emphasises the God-man the decisive and distinguishing fact that the "active" faith is always to be grasped as gift of God: "Ask God that he work the faith in thee, otherwise remainest thou well eternally without faith, thou invent and do what thou wilt or canst." Here stand we at the leaping point; here holds it to understand and not – what very easily happens – to misunderstand. We designate this genuine true faith – as Jesus and Paul taught it – as the "active" faith, and yet is precisely it – as Luther says – "worked through God in us." It is a matter of the beholding of a previously unseen; our old-Indian relatives called it "the grasping of the God's hand." Insofar must one say the process is at the same time active and passive.

Decisive is true that God inclines himself down to me, man, that he stretches the hand toward me; not less decisive is it however that I, man, open the eye and behold God, that I grasp the stretched-out hand – and this "active" deed decides all. For here remains not – as with the mysticism and the magic – still something, properly still all to do, rather is with the faith already all done, because God is it who then performs all. God redeems not only out of the bonds of a limited man-hood, but, in that he does that, gifts he – as we just heard it out of Luther's mouth – a higher, more active, more restless life, which we experience at all our great faith-heroes. Therefore teaches the Saviour: "Each who believes God has life" (Ev. John 6, 47 after the oldest text, the Syrsin). Now is it clear to us why this faith – in opposition to the other meanings of the word – must be called the "active": it is the life-giving faith, yes, the life in God giving – "the faith that through love works itself out" or, as Luther translates, "the faith that through the love is active" (fides, quae per caritatem operatur, Gal. 5, 6). This faith – also that is known to us out of the example of the great Christians – is to the love so near related that both concepts melt into one another; "God is the love": who grasps God's hand can not otherwise than "through love work himself out." Therefore must, as the love, so also the faith every day newly be born, otherwise it dies off and is only as mummy further-dragged; it is a matter of an always bubbling life-spring that daily births new. Upon this points the otherwise hard to understand word: "out of faith to faith" (ex fide in fidem, Romans 1, 17): the faith remains always one and the same, nevertheless experiences who gives himself to God's leading that he daily experiences and achieves unexpected; he climbs just the stage-ladder that leads God-ward, out of faith to faith. So much only for the understanding about the meaning of the third main-stirring which the mind of the inhabitants of the Roman empire around the time of Christ's birth strongly moved, in the striving to mediate between man and God. While however mysticism and magic filled all lands with their essence, persisted the faith in the state of a still slumbering tension-force that only here and there tried to stir itself.

It falls very hard to prove such stirrings, to try it would lead us far and perhaps yet not work convincing. I refer however to the excellent book of Hatch About the Influence of the Greek Ideas and Customs upon the becoming Christian Church (also German by Preuschen), where one in the 11th chapter will find much decisive about the longing after faith under the then mankind; also Reitzenstein, in his book about The Hellenistic Mystery-Religions, points to the arising of a new faith-idea, a conception of the faith as "a divine force that, founded upon personal experience in the mystery, is expressly set opposite to all philosophical conviction," and shows that this thought in bond with the longing after "redemption" (Soteria) as a mighty ferment set spirit and heart of numerous men of the most various dispositions – from the simple souls of enduring poor up to the finest developed bearers of the philosophical and literary education – into a fermenting expectation (p. 9 ff.).

And yet succeeded it not to the faith anywhere to gain footing and to strike root. One is astonished when one learns that the people joined the most various religions at the same time: a man let himself today be initiated into the mysteries of the Dionysus-service, joined tomorrow as mystic the worshippers of Attis, which hindered him not to attach himself to the great community of Osiris (the Isis-worshippers) and also to confess the Mithras-faith. The longing after faith was great, the knowledge of the essence of this spirit-deed however still lacked: therefore the error and confusion. The over-luxuriating of the mysticism on the one side and of the magic on the other contributed also much to the tangle. The more genuine this newly stirring spirit-need, the less could it calm itself at the to it offered fantasies. Holding-for-true can one all possible; genuine faith however effects an inner transformation; that knew the mystery-cults, all promised they the "rebirth" and addressed their newlyinitiated: renatus es, thou art reborn; yet what they promised were they unable to perform, and indeed out of the simple ground because God alone is able to perform that. As long as not the true mediator between man and God had appeared upon earth – visible to the eyes, audible to the ears –, so long held the faith nothing but empty pictures in the hand. This appearing hung however upon God's willdecision, not upon the longing of the men. And see there! God had mercy upon us; the decisive event of all mankind-history happened; the mediator appeared, lived and taught under us, died – because he was a man, and rose again to life – because he was God. What to us mortals thereby for possibilities were opened shall in the following chapters of this book come to speech. Here, where only of the necessity and of the meaning of the concept of the mediation and of the mediator is the speech, content I myself therewith to make attentive that that disciple who stood nearest to Jesus, John – instead of to circle the meaning of his Master through the confining idea of the Messiah – designates him once with the beautiful Greek name of the Paraclete, in that he speaks of him as "our mediator with the Father" (1 Ep. John 2, 1), from which the clear knowledge of the all man-hood encompassing meaning of the happening shines forth. Now had the faith received life-breath; as soon as the grace sank itself down, needed he only to strive upward and to grasp it; thereby had the rebirth become a reality, and the immortality received, if also not a graspable presentability, at least sense and moral meaning. At once swung the faith itself up to dizzying heights: for this gives it no more gripping proof than the letter of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, to the young Christian community in Rome – a letter to which as testimony of human hero-courage out of the entire history of the mankind well little equals. The pious old one, who possibly, as the tradition will, as child had beheld the Saviour with eyes and who – as that also may be – in any case was pupil of his immediate disciples and thus bore the with nothing to compare impression of the divine personality out of only one-time mirroring in the soul, the pious old one had been condemned to be exposed to the wild animals in the arena at Rome, and was now as prisoner under soldierly care led away from Syria into the capital. On the way overcomes him the care that the Christian community in Rome – which already was numerous and not without influence at the imperial court – could enter in his favour and effect his liberation or at least the remission of the death-penalty. Highest probable – so assure us the present knowers of the relations – would such a step of the community not have remained unsuccessful. Then composes Ignatius on the way to the faith-comrades in Rome a letter that he sends ahead thither through a quickly travelling messenger.

Out of that be some places communicated: “I fear your love that it could harm me. … Be it to you manly known that I out of own free will die for God – if only you hinder me not thereat. I beg you, show me no untimely love: let me be exposed to the wild animals, for through them can I arrive to God. I am God’s wheat; if the teeth of the wild animals crush me, so will I be found as pure bread of Christ. I ask you, stir the wild animals against me, so that their bodies become my tomb and no little bit of my corpse remain back. … When in this way to all eyes my corporality will have vanished, then, yes then am I in truth a disciple of Jesus Christ. … The birth-pains of a new birth overcome me! Have patience with me, dear brothers: hinder me not to enter into the life; wish not my death; give not One of the world back who longs to be with God, nor seek to bribe him through worldly promises. Grant it that I enter into the pure light: there arrived, will I first be a true man” (after Lightfoot’s transmission into English). Before this faith vanished all the religions that filled the Roman world, and of which many had bloomed more than a millennium, in astonishingly short time without trace away, as if they had never been – they vanished as dreams when we open the eyes to the light of the day. Try we today to make present to ourselves the events of that distant time, nothing will appear more noteworthy to us, and few things will teach us more about the invincible force of the Christian faith than the quiet, quick withering of all these religions of the mere mysticism and magic, in spite of the most unitarily built-up, strongest state that the world has ever known protecting them and furthering them according to forces. The Mediator had brought about the turning-point of all religion and thereby of all man-dignity: “For all that is born of God overcomes the world, and our faith is the victory that has overcome the world” (1 Ep. John 5, 4). The Saviour The revelation of the mystery that through world-ages through remained silent, now however is revealed. (Paul, the Apostle) Every century brings forth its own madness, born out of false directions into which its thinking with historically conditioned necessity falls; later times reveal themselves such delusion-ideas without further as errors, yes, stick into the eye, yet as long as their rule holds, are also the cleverest men – after the majority – as struck by blindness. Under the numerous hereto belonging follies of the nineteenth century will to future races certainly none seem worse than the in various varieties always again appeared and with applause received teaching that Jesus of Nazareth is a mythical shape, thus one by men invented, no real personality that in flesh and blood once walked upon earth. After the ones shall there have been at all no man of this name (so for example after J.M. Robertson: Christianity and Mythology, 1900); others – more earnest to take – scholars denied not the existence of Jesus, held him however for a more or less obscure Galilean religion-enthusiast and people-agitator, the like of which a number are known out of the history, declared however the evangelical reports in the essential for free inventions, the to Jesus ascribed words for unauthentic, in short, the to the European mankind since soon two millennia familiar shape for an invented fantasy-formation – invented namely by Paul, the rabbi-pupil, and a small group of fanatics that soon expanded itself in that the religious madness seized around and from all sides brought new mythical material thereto, so that in short time a complete teaching-building stood there, out of pure air-formations carpentered. These attempts to rob the personality of the Saviour of all own-life reach from David Friedrich Strauss in the year 1835 up to Arthur Drews in the year 1909. It is not my intention to go into this literature; who wishes to occupy himself therewith be referred to the excellent work of Albert Schweitzer, History of the Life-of-JesusResearch. I, for my part, lament every hour that I – driven by pedantic conscientiousness – used upon it. Even a Strauss – whose knowledge and ability deserve high regard – was not able otherwise: once fallen upon the ground-false track, must he always deeper into the thicket of the inconsistencies, of the impossibilities and at last of the nonsenses entangle himself; his followers however and over-bidders – to him in specialist knowledge not equal – have brought it up to such a degree of contradiction-sense that one must ask oneself whether they have their readers for the best, or whether their own judgment-force really completely suffered shipwreck?

Meanwhile went the entire true science – and indeed in all its shadings, from the strictest orthodoxy up to the free-sense and up to the declared opponents of the Christian religion-thoughts – the exactly opposed way, removed one historical doubt after the other, discovered many documents and inscriptions that all pointed into the same direction and at the same time with new enlightenment brought new confirmation; today – that may one without exaggeration assert as secured fact – are the first Christian centuries more exactly known than many to us nearer-lying, and indeed – in spite of all still gaping gaps – into details into about which knowledge to gain earlier research never had dared to hope. It belongs unabashed boldness and naive limitation thereto still in the twentieth century to assert that Christ's life represents the course of the sun through the animal-circle, and the Apostle Peter is nothing other than the out of the Hellenic gods-saga known Proteus who in the commission of Poseidon "pastures the lambs"! Such nonsense finds however the effective assistance of our Jewish world-press that with sure instinct seizes all that appears to it suited to harm the hated Christianity; in consequence experiences the layman – if he possesses not special connections – of the true results of the science so good as nothing. A further consideration deserves however not smaller attention than the preceding. Were the sources still worse buried than they are, and were thereby to the scientific research the many results upon which it today with joyful pride can point denied, the historicity of Jesus Christ and of the circle of his first disciples and adherents, as well as the reliability in all essential traits of the reports about his life, his teaching and his dying would stand nevertheless for every healthily judging man unshakably firm. Overturning religion-movements have always – that teaches all history – gone out from mighty, lonely standing personalities: far-reaching effects upon the souls of many men is able only an over-great soul to gain, a soul as it in the course of the millennia scarcely once appears.

Truth arise under the pressure of world-historical events and states special spirit-moods that as diseases through transmission spread and up to mass-madness can heighten: in this connection would also upon the longing after that mind-constitution that we name faith and that we in the previous chapter learned to know to be referred. In the time around Christ's birth seized this longing the various peoples of the Roman empire: old religions awoke suddenly to new life, even the otherwise every stranger rejecting Judaism let itself then temporarily upon conversion in and gained – especially under the women – numerous proselytes; new cults sprang out of the fruitful imagination-force of the Asiatic mixedpeoples; the state itself granted protection and support. All these attempts to lead to the mind the longed-for refreshment found adherents and confessors, and indeed the more as no religion fought the others: who today in the house of Mithras had performed his devotion joined tomorrow the shining procession of the Isis-priests; so hunted each after the weal. Such a fermentation in the soul-life of the peoples has naturally something to mean and leads especially easily to catastrophes; yet possesses it in and for itself not the least shaping-force; the newer psychology and medicine has proved these appearances as effects of the so-called suggestion whose essence a weakening of the judgment-force and paralysis of the own-will in favour of blind herd-instincts makes out, consequently stands so far as possible from creating-force and free shaping-joy. Inadmissible appears therefore from the outset the thought that out of the commonness of hundred-thousands of ordinary and thereto still soul-weakened and erred men – as the then ones unquestionably were – a new, all until now existing overturning world-view could go forth – a wholly and completely new conception of the dignity of the man, footing upon a wholly and completely new idea of his relation to God. Were – about in consequence of a mighty earth-shaking – all written testimonies that report of the foundation and of the first development-time destroyed, – the mere fact of the existence of the Christian faith-teaching and mindconstitution would with unavoidable necessity point upon a founder. Now are we however, as already remarked, besides in the position to follow the first steps of the into life stepping Christianity with astonishing exactness; every one should endeavour about this knowledge – whereto as best introduction Adolf Harnack's Mission and Spread of the Christianity in the first three centuries may serve: who, instead of taking the Christianity in dull self-understandability as given fact, informs himself about these beginnings, will see the greatest wonder of the world-history unroll itself before his eyes.

The wonders that the evangelists ascribe to Jesus Christ reach all not to this wonder of the spread of the Christianity. It is the victory of the spirit over the matter, the victory of pure faith-force over the strongest ruler-power that has ever upon earth ruled. Upon the one side a handful of men without regard, without means, without influence, upon the other side the Imperium Romanum, in brazen invincibility hurling its veto against them. The old state-religions and the various mystery-religions that all with one another lived upon the best foot of mutual tolerating are from the beginning one in the hate-filled rejection of the Christianity which on its side likewise denied them the existence-right, so that a fight upon life and death was called up by the Christianity itself. All foremost hunts the already then influential Judaism and causes the first cruel persecutions; always anew repeat themselves these, and even the philosopher upon the emperor-seat, otherwise proclaimer of all-sided tolerance, tries to eradicate the hated Christians through fire, sword and wild animals. No political counter-effect of any kind stands to the over the world scattered Christians at disposal; every defence through weapon-force is excluded; they can only endure and die: how they do that have we in the previous chapter at the example of the Ignatius of Antioch seen. Worldly considered is the continuance of the Christianity over the two first centuries out – let alone its victory – at all not to explain; it is a matter just, as already said, of a victory of pure spiritual forces over all that otherwise determines the man out of need, instinct and passion.

One knows the word of Cecil Rhodes, worth for all times as the confession of the Antichrist to be nailed: "Every man is to buy; only the price is different"; here now found themselves many thousand men, women and also children ready every moment to sacrifice all that the life offered and promised them and without hesitating to step into the most tormenting death; what their spirit held fast counted to them as highest good: a transformation, a new birth must with them have taken place. And what had effected it? Whence stemmed this new, to the then world unknown force? Into their souls had the faith drawn in. And which faith? The faith in God through Jesus Christ. The old feeling of the presence of a "highest good being," of a "Father in heaven" (see p. 24), had gradually with increasing complication of the civilisation and rising refinement of the culture been lost; Jesus brought the message of this God again, and indeed upon a higher stage of the conscious grasping, whereby man and God stepped immediately near to one another. This suddenly blooming faith lived however first only in the heart of the one incomparable; first from this heart out radiated it into the other hearts: the way to God led through Jesus through; no other way led thither. We have seen the men how they full of longing stretched the arms after a mediator and sought to birth this out of their fantasy: they came never to the goal, fantasy-picture remained fantasy-picture, never arrived they to the faith. Now however was the mediator appeared! Before his mere face remained all good men shaken astonished; his eye penetrated into the last depths of their souls, there forces waking or giving – who could decide that? –, of which they until now nothing had divined; and when then his mouth opened itself to words the like of which never had been heard, believed they to hear God himself speak. It sufficed a "Stand up and follow me!" – and the world with its cares and hopes, with its sufferings and joys was forgotten. These disciples were neither at means nor at spirit rich; also took they their experience not up with conscious, distinguishing thinking; at some reflection however understand we right well that precisely such men were the most suited to purely mirror an unheard new; true mirror they at the same time the ideas of their time – that happens however with so complete simplicity that the disentangling makes small difficulties: mad is it precisely to these first bearers of the Christianity to ascribe any self-willed mythical and other religion-forming additions; thereto were they just as unable as unwilling. A unique exception – both in regard to education as to gift – offers the Apostle Paul; yet precisely this one are we in the position to follow exactly at the work: certainly underlies he more manifold influences than his Galilean comrades – we will later have to speak about that –, yet the more exactly his teaching is researched, the mightier proves itself the influence of the by him exactly known words and directions of Jesus (see especially the thorough investigations of Paul Feine, Paul Kölbing and Gardner); also with him are therefore the time-influences not hard to separate.

In short, we have it with well-testified historical processes to do: that can only the malicious or the cross-headed or the unknowing still today deny: the science and the judgment-force have spoken their unique word. Hereby is now not asserted that we possess in the Gospels a history-work in the sense that we today attach to this word: against such a misunderstanding may it scarcely be needful to raise objection. Important is against that the consideration whether it would have been possible to any still so gifted scientifically pre-educated history-researcher to create a book that in content-richness and in world encompassing effect-power would have come equal even from afar to the book that we possess? The question can with all determinateness be denied. It falls hard to me, yes, it will not succeed to me to find the words for an insight that to us of today very is needful; perhaps suffices a pointing so that the reader grasp whereupon it goes out. So imperfect, gap-rich, misty, ungraspable the news are that we possess about the Saviour, I am convinced it would have been impossible to a divine providence to find a more fitting vessel for the communication upon which it here came. Every approach to protocol-like exactness would have distorted the real truth just so and robbed it of its pulsing content as that a photograph does opposite the nature. Here comes it upon space, upon air, upon resonance; every intentionality, every human wisebeing-willing would have extinguished all: that holds of the words as of the deeds.

The voice of Jesus hear we only thanks to the circumstance that the disciples took up his words true into pious hearts, yet never wholly understood them; and had they not seen him work wonders, they would have been unable to let us feel his wonder-working essence. In the last end comes it upon an stimulating to own deed: that Jesus was a historical person forms only a part of the evangelical message; what it above all will is to convince us of his presence: we shall open the eyes and behold him himself, we shall hear his voice in the own ear. Origen speaks a wonderful word: “O that also to us the Lord Jesus would lay his hands upon the eyes, so that also we began not to look upon that which is visible, but upon the invisible, and he to us … unveiled the glance of the heart with which God in the spirit is beheld through him, the Lord Jesus Christ” (after Harnack). Hereby is exactly designated what the evangelical reports shall perform – and also perform as soon as their word falls upon receptive ground: unveil the glance of the heart! Upon the Gospels will we still in the sequence come back; for the moment suffices it to me if I – without denying the gaps, the unclarities and the contradictions – have awakened the thought that in this one, incomparable case veiling leads to unveiling. One of the characteristic errors of our time, not alone upon religious but also upon nature-scientific field, is the not-knowing of that which one can and shall ask; every question pose we, only not this; did we it, would with one stroke many mis-tones and foolish prejudices vanish out of the spirit-life of our publicity. Of God – that saw we in the first chapter – is the human understanding able scarcely something further to state than that he is and must be, because we men otherwise would be no men; for the rest can the understanding, if it remains referred upon itself, scarcely come out over the “neti, neti!” Set thus the case that the Divine will mix itself as appearance under the men, is it also only thinkable that we men with our so limited understanding would be able to present to ourselves in which way this flesh-becoming (incarnation) would take place? That is excluded: every hereabout dared statement can only be a picture, at best a myth. So for example are the many disputes about the virgin-birth well considered objectless. The narration is in and for itself beautiful and meaningful; upon the asserted impossibility is no weight to lay – instructs us yet the nature every day that that which we held for impossible happens; only can no man think himself something thereby, because virgin and mother are contradicting concepts: and a perfect contradiction remains equal mysterious for wise as for fools. It is also no ground inventible why at the birth of a divine being the masculine stem should remain switched out – be it that still Hellenic ideas of gods-kinship hovered before the spirit. The Gospels leave knownly this question open in that they contradict themselves; quite sure is that neither Paul nor John have known something of the birth of Christ out of a virgin; John names the Saviour simply son of Joseph (1, 45), and Paul mentions his mother as well as the nearer circumstances of his birth at all never – now however over-think one oneself which weight precisely this man would have laid upon such a fact!

He who must be named the creator of the Christian myth: his silence proves that the to us in twofold shape, out of Matthew and Luke, familiar narration was to him either unknown or seemed unauthentic; says he yet of the Saviour expressly "who is come out of David's seed after the flesh" (Rom. 1, 3). And the Apostle John says at all of all those men who are suited to become "God's children": "They are not out of blood and not out of flesh's- also not out of man's will, but out of God begotten" (John 1, 12 ff.). How much wiser were the earliest Christians than their followers! The same holy martyr Ignatius to whom we already repeatedly have met writes in his letter to the Ephesians: "For our God, Jesus the Christ, was after God's weal-council in the body of Mary received, true out of the seed of David, but yet at the same time out of holy spirit" (18, 2) – whereby the words "seed of David" unquestionably point upon the fatherhood of Joseph, since Mary after oldest tradition belonged to the tribe of Levi. To this apostle-pupil made thus the idea that Christ as man is son of Joseph and at the same time as God the Son of God no difficulty, nor found he therein something degrading. Out of such things to make forced faith-articles (dogmas) to which every one is obligated to believe hold I for a crime against the man-spirit and thereby also against the holy Spirit of God.

For at facts that our understanding is not able to grasp – as the appearance of an over-human being upon earth is one –, can we only groping dare near; what is according to the one can seem unacceptable to the other; to each must the freedom remain preserved to elevate himself God-ward upon the to his nature corresponding way; upon this whole field must we recognise the ground-principle: various statements – also if they contradict themselves – can equal one another in truth-content. Jesus Christ has as mediator between God and man dwelled upon earth and is for our redemption died: that can we know; all further leave the Gospels in the half-dark – and that they do that witnesses of divine mastership. What here of the birth is said holds also of the death – only in reverse direction: in the one case can our understanding not grasp what preceded, in the other not what followed. We can just always and everywhere perceive Jesus only there with the senses and follow him with the thinking where he gives himself as man; as soon as he is God, vanishes he out of this glance-circle, and so firm also the mind through faith may hold to him, every statement about him receives now another character. About all events that immediately precede the death are we especially thorough and exact informed; with the moment of the death sinks as it were a mist before the eyes down, the four evangelical reports agree no more and are partially jump-like and ambiguous, – point also here and there visible traces of later overworking. About the resurrection has unoverlookably much been written by the specialist scholars; for not alone brings every commentary to every of the Gospels and to the first letter of Paul to the Corinthians thorough executions, as well as the same every life of Jesus, but there is a whole book-shelf of writings that uniquely dedicate themselves to the investigation of this one question – and indeed without ever to reach a result that the consent of all forces. Upon that lies now little or rather at all nothing: uniquely thereupon comes it that one gain the insight that here upon purely logical way no result is to be expected, because it is a matter of processes which the world of the appearance, upon whose knowledge our understanding and the to it serving senses are restricted, true touch and as it were cross through, yet for the greater part play themselves outside this boundary. That the first Christians believed in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead needs no proof: the Christianity arose yes as consequence of the resurrection, and long years sounded the greeting of the meeting ones: "Christ is risen!" One may think and interpret this "rising" as one will – at the fact itself can no judgment-capable man pass by. True have the Jews at once asserted that the disciples had stolen the corpse out of the grave in order then to be able to state that their Master is risen from the dead; yet convinces the least reflection that this clumsy invention sets up at the same time impossible and insufficient. The frightened, through the execution of their leader of all hope robbed disciples had fled and held themselves hidden; besides was to them the concept of a resurrection foreign, for it belonged not to the then in the Judaism familiar ideas, and we know that they could not explain to themselves words of the Saviour that pointed upon his resurrection after the death:

"And the disciples negotiated among themselves what that means, to rise from the dead" (Mark 9, 10 and see for example John 2, 22): it is to them therefore neither the capacity to execute the robbery nor the thought to do it to trust. Far more into weight fall however against this assertion two other considerations. First appears with these simple Galileans among whom then no unique man of outstanding energy and initiative was to find such a Machiavellian plan unconditionally excluded, just as the spiritual force upon this way to wish to found a new religion. Second however is it downright brain-burned to presuppose that a between two or three dark-men agreed lie would have sufficed to call forth the unstoppable movement that at once seized hundreds and thousands of man-hearts, filled with heavenly hoping and steeled to unshakable God-faith. With right replies Origen to the denier Celsus that the behaviour of the disciples, their suddenly bright flaring-up faith, the in them awakened, all hindrances defying deed-force and the persuasion-power that they gained over thousands, these undeniable historical facts are in and for themselves the most binding and irrefutable proof that they had seen with eyes the from the dead risen Jesus, for out of this overpowering experience had they first drawn the force to all further (Book 1, Chapter 31). This judgment hits today just so as in the year two hundred where it was spoken; yes, I assert: the existence of the Christianity proves the fact of the resurrection. As the Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians: "Is however Christ not raised, so is your faith in vain. … If we have nothing but the hope upon Christ in this life, so are we the most lamentable of all men" (1 Cor. 15, 17, 19). How the resurrection is to be thought, that is a wholly other question. I for my part join myself to one of the most significant heads among the contemporary German theologians, the critically and thoroughly free thinking Friedrich Loofs, and confess "that nobody can stretch himself with his thinking out over our until now experience: how that which the disciples experienced was possible, – that know I not. … I know it not and I hold not-knowing here not for truth-shyness" (The ResurrectionReports and their Value, 3rd ed., p. 40 ff.). True would it be of interest to know how the men who beheld the Risen one interpreted their vision; yet lets itself out of the reports nothing exact and especially nothing agreeing take: some describe circumstances that exclude a massive corporality, others emphasise precisely this. Only about one man's judgment know we exact information: the Apostle Paul writes in the same chapter in which he enumerates the appearances of the Risen one: "That however say I, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor inherits the decay the undecayability" (1 Cor. 15, 50), and still more of the like, and in his letter to the Philippians he distinguishes between the earthly "body of our humiliation" and the "body of the glory" of the risen Jesus (3, 21). It can thus underlie no doubt that this most significant among the first Christians thought not of a resurrection of the died body, but of the further-living in transfigured shape outside the to us familiar conditions of earthly existence (1 Cor. 15, 44 ff.). This confirms decisively a circumstance that many well overlook: Paul enumerates all appearances of the Risen one of which he knows in sequence (at the same place, Verse 5 ff.), mentions however with no syllable the empty grave nor the therewith hanging together visit of the women – the empty grave possessed thus for him no meaning, perhaps held he this narration for a pious legend. In order to overlook the connection and thus also rightly to judge, must one know and consider the following fact. We heard above of the malicious tale of the Jews that Christ's disciples had secretly removed his corpse out of the grave. Many a reader will have asked himself what this desecration of the grave-rest should have aimed at? The Semites and with them the Jews – at the coarse materialism that distinguishes their religious life from that of other men – are unable to present to themselves a future life if not the same body serves also further as carrier to this new life. I can for this cite the few days ago appeared work of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Plato (1919, 1, 335): "Who for the Semitic thinking-kind is not fallen to the death, who thus is thought further working, must either together with his body be raised into the immortality, or together with his body be risen out of the death"; while the Hellene already at Homer's times was familiar with the idea of an "unsensual bodylessness," "can the Semite not loose himself from the bodily."

In these ideas were the disciples of Christ together with their surroundings grown up; that may not be overlooked: for out of that first understands one the accusation of the Jews, and at the same time works this Jewish materialism upon the conception of the disciples of their experiences, in consequence also upon their presentation. Paul however, as religious genius, who besides since early youth had stood under the influence of a Hellenistic environment, grasped, as we saw, the resurrection of Christ otherwise and needed for it no breaking-open of the grave-gate. True may Wilamowitz with the fine remark be right that Paul remains insofar materialist as the by him taught "pneumatic body," made out of "heavenly stuff," is still always a body; yet mean I he has therewith done so significant a step upon the way to the idealisation that one fairly could not expect more of him. Knownly has the Church not followed him, rather remained it caught in the coarse sensuality of Semitic half-thoughts. To the conclusion of this discussion serve a glorious word of Luther: "For we speak and confess this article (of the resurrection) in the prayer not therefore that it alone has happened, as we otherwise narrate a fable, fairy-tale or history; but that it in the heart become strong, true and living.

And that name we faith when we so imagine it to ourselves that we wholly and completely stick ourselves into it, even as if otherwise nothing other were written than: Christ is risen!" And still one. Should a friend wish to hear my own confession, I would say to him the following. In that Jesus – insofar he was man, the perfectus homo of the ecclesiastical confessions – died, vanished he out of the world of the space and of the time, thereby also out of the history; "know" can I since the moment of his death nothing more about him, only believe. Precisely because I had the fortune to receive the schooling of the exact science and besides was instructed by Immanuel Kant "he had to abolish the knowledge in order to gain place for the faith" (Pure Reason, Pref. to 2nd ed., p. XXX). – Thanks to these both circumstances am I accustomed to distinguish with sharpness between knowledge and faith. What I believe stands in my mind still deeper anchored than that which I mean to know; it stands however at other place, under other laws, and it falls me in consequence hard to find myself into the heads of the uninstructed, as well as to grant them insight into my head, since the most possess about this distinction no clear idea. I know that the sun stands in the heaven; firmer and more certain and richer in content is however my faith in Jesus Christ as my Saviour. What Christ has brought to us is the faith in God: "If you knew me, so knew you also my Father" (John 8, 19). The oldest Christians have known that well, and we read for example in the Epistle to Diognetus: "For who under all men has, before Christ appeared, also only in the least known what God is?" God the unperceivable, unthinkable became in Christ visible and spoke as man to us audible words whose over-earthly sound tones to us today just so in the ears as to the men before two thousand years. As the Apostle Paul of the appearance of Christ says: "It let it day in our hearts to the shining rising of the knowledge and of the glory of God upon the face of Christ" (2 Cor. 4, 6). Jesus the revelation of God upon earth: that is the content of the "glad-message." That God does not die to the death is clear; the death can at highest redeem him out of the pressure of a temporarily assumed corporality: Jesus lives from ever to ever. Therefore designate I without hesitation the word "resurrection" as allegory; stand, arise, rise are concepts which presuppose a spatial world and a temporal determination; I explain to myself however the use of this allegory right well, already out of the above described Jewish thinking-kind, as well as also out of the need of the historical attachment to the just closed life. Should the disciples finally grasp the sense of this life, the sense of their enormous experience and thereby first be made capable for their world-historical office, so must Jesus appear to them and speak to them: for this necessity possess we the historical proof; for first out of this with nothing to compare event arose – as we already saw – the Christianity. About the kind however how these appearances are understanding-wise to interpret confess I my ignorance and confess that I hold every explanation from the outset for impossible and reject every dogmatic decision hereabout. For this my conception appeal I still once to Origen; this one writes at a place of his De Principiis (Book 2, Chapter 6, Section 2) where he speaks of the flesh-becoming, the death and the resurrection:

"With such things to turn oneself to human ears and to try to set them apart in words, that surpasses far the capacities of our understanding and of our language; yes, I am even of the opinion that it has surpassed the capacities of the holy apostles; probably are also the heavenly beings unable to grasp these mysteries thinking." Between the unsearchable entry into the earthly existence and the of never to interpret mysteries surrounded exit out of this existence into another, to our understanding ungraspable, lies a short life that up to the last eight days – as soon as one looks at it from outside – world-distant and eventless runs; of no to us known religion-founder or reformer knows the history similar to report; rather see we men of this kind through inner soul-torments fight themselves through up to mighty decisions in order then to step out and upon the them surrounding world overturning to work – it be here only reminded of Buddha, Mohammed and Luther. With Jesus is neither of the passionate war in the own bosom nor of the overturn of existing institutions the speech.

Would one throw in that we know so good as nothing about the first thirty years of this life and could therefore about the inner fights nothing state, I would contradict that: for there consists intimate connection between the inner soul-fights of the religionrenewers and the kind of their later violent deed-force: for the divine rest that from the beginning on must have filled Jesus' heart witnesses his silent enduring when the world finally had become attentive upon him and strove his death. True will we not estimate low the meaningful allegory of the temptation in the desert as unhistorical; yet precisely this kind to withdraw oneself in the hour of the temptation into the solitude, of the evil stirrings still determinedly to become master and then into the accustomed surroundings calmly to return witnesses of a heavenly harmony of the soul for which we possess no second example.

Every of us must now above all feel the commanding urge to call this heavenly harmony as it as personality walked upon earth – the "Son of Man" as it loved to designate itself – as living as possible before eyes; the whole Christianity roots in the with nothing to compare impression that this personality made upon some hundred men and left with them as source of immeasurable force. The many for whom Jesus Christ means a mere name, yet also not these alone, but also those who believe in him as

Redeemer and worship him as God, divine not what is lacking to them as long as they lack the named idea. The Gospels, so gap-rich also their reports may be, harbour – and for him who understands not to read them, hide – a fullness of facts suited to bring the Saviour near and always nearer to us. Upon the question after the race-belonging of the families of Joseph and of Mary will I here not go in, first because it is unsolvable, second because we do well to revere the mystery of the birth of our Saviour [Footnote: What here about would be to say have I in the chapter "The Appearance of Christ" of my Foundations tried to summarise; in a historical work was such a discussion in place. Add will I only that a learned specialist, Professor Haupt in Baltimore, since then has spoken the conjecture that Mary and Joseph were after the race Aryan Medes, which he especially grounds therewith that the inhabitants of Galilee after the majority were Medes. (This communication take I out of the work of the English theologian Mac Clymont: New Testament Criticism, its history and results, 1913, p. 150.) – Meanwhile is the writing of Delitzsch The Great Deception (1920) appeared in which we read p. 94: "Jesus' parents and ancestors were as Galileans after Old-Testament as well as cuneiform testimony quite certainly not of Jewish blood, but belonged to the great number of Galilean Jewish proselytes. That Jesus was no prophet of Jewish blood teaches his to the Jewish diametrically opposed Godconcept and confirm all his speeches together with his whole life and dying."]. It suffices us to know that the Saviour true was educated in the Israelite faith, yet not lived in a surroundings that one in the narrower sense of the word could name "Jewish." The inhabitants of Galilee (of the "heathen-district") formed a essentially other stamp of men than the Jews of Judea, stood also politically under another government; they distinguished themselves through work-lust, cheerful mind-kind, energetic independence-sense – which they in their repeated uprisings heroically proved. "A Galilean and a determined man means in the Jewish language-use the same," remarks Herder.

The Jews have never recognised the Galileans as full-Jews; to them was for example the public reading at the God-service within Judea forbidden; their pronunciation be so neglected – so was mocked – that one at a definite word know not whether the Galilean speaks of wine, of wool, of an ass or of a lamb (Lightfoot: Galatians, p. 197). Under these men has now Jesus lived his life and under them found his adherents – the first mediators of the Christian faith. "Good was it," writes Herder, "that Christ far from Judea and the proud Jerusalem, although only short time, drove his business in this province (Galilee); there would one not have granted him also this short time. Here spoke he with the common, a lively people, with men of healthy understanding, at their businesses. Also his more intimate pupils had he chosen himself out of these regions …" (Of the Redeemer of the Men, Section 3, Abs. 9).

Every man knows the places of the Gospels in which Jesus and his adherents are mocked as "Galileans," and A. Merx beholds in the speech of Caiaphas (John 11, 19–50) a sign therefor that the high-priest regarded the Saviour "not as a full-Israelite" (The Four Canonical Gospels, Final Volume, p. 299). To the fact of this Galilean surroundings is however, as one sees, the usual idea of the Saviour as a Jew in the Jew-land by no means just. Even apart from the main-shape conditioned the kind of the counter- effect another life in Galilee than it in Judea would have been the case, and determined thus the starting-point of the Christianity. Heed we further that the Saviour grew up upon the land (Nazareth was a village), in the midst of a healthy farmer-people, in a richly blessed, laughing beautiful region, – far thus from all city-misery and – as said – outside the landscape-wise comfortlessly desolate homeland of the actual Jews, Judea. Enough for the time about the outer conditions under which the personality made itself known; turn we ourselves to the inward. Something that would equal an enumerating description of pure human traits finds itself in the Gospels nowhere; nevertheless discovers the attentive reader numerous pointings, sufficient in order, if not an executed portrait, yet a definite impression – material for rich after-thinking – to gain. We find there utterances of the joy, of the pain, of the compassion, of the astonishment, of the despair; great passionateness radiates out of various sayings, for example: "I am come to throw a fire upon the earth, and what would I rather than that it already burned!" (Luke 12, 49); yes, early texts report even of upwellings of the raging and becoming-angry; so sounds for example Mark 8, 12 in the oldest of all known manuscripts (by the science named Syrsin): "And he became in the spirit angry," and in other old texts: "He raged in his spirit." Unfortunately are the most of these small pure human traits by later pious editors erased – not out of the conscious intention to falsify the text, but out of the concern that all-too human traits could do break to the reverence before the God; in the above case for example read we today: "He sighed up in his spirit." In the scientific books finds one examples enough of this gradual down-toning of originally present colours. How much however that one still can discover who approaches the texts not with cold scepticism but with loving knowledge-curiosity proves at best the section with Burkitt about a certain bitter cheerfulness or "mournful irony" that with the Saviour often breaks through and was grasped neither by his disciples nor by their followers, since this mind-mood remained wholly foreign to that of the early Christianity in that it points upon a superior freedom of the spirit: Burkitt has especially the place at Luke 22, 35 ff. in mind where the Saviour at the evening of the taking-prisoner recommends to his disciples the purchase of swords as if he intended to rely upon weapon-force (Gospel Transmission, Chapter 4). Even about daily habits experience we many things: so for example the love to the solitude (Mark 1, 45), the rising at day-break in order quietly out of the midst of the sleeping disciples to slip away to the unguided early-walk over the fields (Mark 1, 38) or up upon a height (Mark 3, 13), so that the astonished and apparently offended adherents have trouble to find their Master; another time in order to escape the touches of the crowd jumps Jesus quickly into a boat and lets push off from the shore (Mark 3, 10). Deeper than these observations leads us into the essence of the Saviour the immersion into his language: upon this way arrive we stage-wise always more into the inward. The speaking in parables is true in the Orient usual; yet comes it with Jesus not upon the parables alone – so unexampled and inimitable also these flowed out of his mouth – rather speaks he also outside the actual parables almost always in pictures, and these pictures are borrowed from the observation of the nature and of the human work upon the land.

Already before two and a half centuries has a man whose capacity to "objective" judgment even the doubter will not deny, Sir Isaac Newton, in his Commentary about the Book Daniel pointed upon this distinguishing peculiarity of the language of the Saviour who instead of – as the Orientals – dramatically-effectful and quite frequently bombastic comparisons to draw near always with perfected simplicity attaches to that which lies before eyes to him and his companions: to all knows he to gain meaning – also to the sparrow upon the roof and the anemone upon the field.

And what Newton, the astronomer and physicist, with his sharp eye had observed, that has our contemporary F. Crawford Burkitt – acknowledgedly the most significant among the living theologians of England – upon ground of his specialist knowledge confirmed: the entire literature can exhibit nothing that in regard to thought- and expression-style also only in the most distant would possess similarity with the parables of Jesus (The Gospel History and its Transmission, Chapter 6). First effects the perfection in the picture-ness of the speaking-way that the single word in a certain sense loses at meaning, – insofar namely as the thoughts lie wholly and completely in the pictures – not properly in the words which mediate the pictures –: out of that follows now however a circumstance that for the preservation and further-effect of the words of the Saviour has possessed decisive meaning and still today lends them a freshness as if they were spoken yesterday. The smaller the value that comes to the oratorical, the logical-dialectical at a linguistic communication, and the more perfected plastic-visible the expression stands before eyes, the easier will it fall to the hearers to render not wordtrue, well however matter-true reports about the once heard: the words may they forget, the pictures remain engraved to the memory. Who in Burkitt's before cited book attentively considers the chapter in which this scholar lays before thirty-one manifoldly testified Lord-words in their various versions will with astonishment discover that these differences – which partly concern the word-sound, partly the accompanying circumstances under which a saying was done – exercise little or at all no remodelinfluencing upon the in a parable communicated truth. The pictures had been so plastic and penetrating that they remained unerasable hanging in the memory; and upon them came it. The same circumstance explains it that the genuine sayings of the Saviour can be translated into all languages of the world without losing of their effect-force; against that for example it falls very hard to bring the sense of many executions of the Apostle Paul without help of the Greek original-text exactly to the understanding, and just so must also his out of the then life of a Greek harbour-city and of the thoughtworld of the Hellenistic mystery-religions taken pictures without explanation remain ununderstandable. Jesus' words – mediated through his pictures – remain accessible to all times and peoples: "Heaven and earth will pass away; my words however will not pass away." One sees: already the mere immersion into the language of Jesus teaches us much about him – and indeed far more important than a chronicle of his earth-days could offer; for at this life comes it uniquely upon soul-beholding. And at the word soul-beholding falls me in that a second mathematician, equal to Newton in meaning, Blaise Pascal, has pointed us the way out of the speaking-way of the Saviour to a still deeper glance consent of all forces. Upon that lies now little or rather at all nothing: uniquely thereupon comes it that one gain the insight that here upon purely logical way no result is to be expected, because it is a matter of processes which the world of the appearance, upon whose knowledge our understanding and the to it serving senses are restricted, true touch and as it were cross through, yet for the greater part play themselves outside this boundary. That the first Christians believed in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead needs no proof: the Christianity arose yes as consequence of the resurrection, and long years sounded the greeting of the meeting ones: "Christ is risen!" One may think and interpret this "rising" as one will – at the fact itself can no judgment-capable man pass by. True have the Jews at once asserted that the disciples had stolen the corpse out of the grave in order then to be able to state that their Master is risen from the dead; yet convinces the least reflection that this clumsy invention sets up at the same time impossible and insufficient.

The frightened, through the execution of their leader of all hope robbed disciples had fled and held themselves hidden; besides was to them the concept of a resurrection foreign, for it belonged not to the then in the Judaism familiar ideas, and we know that they could not explain to themselves words of the Saviour that pointed upon his resurrection after the death: "And the disciples negotiated among themselves what that means, to rise from the dead" (Mark 9, 10 and see for example John 2, 22): it is to them therefore neither the capacity to execute the robbery nor the thought to do it to trust. Far more into weight fall however against this assertion two other considerations.

First appears with these simple Galileans among whom then no unique man of outstanding energy and initiative was to find such a Machiavellian plan unconditionally excluded, just as the spiritual force upon this way to wish to found a new religion. Second however is it downright brain-burned to presuppose that a between two or three dark-men agreed lie would have sufficed to call forth the unstoppable movement that at once seized hundreds and thousands of man-hearts, filled with heavenly hoping and steeled to unshakable God-faith. With right replies Origen to the denier Celsus that the behaviour of the disciples, their suddenly bright flaring-up faith, the in them awakened, all hindrances defying deed-force and the persuasion-power that they gained over thousands, these undeniable historical facts are in and for themselves the most binding and irrefutable proof that they had seen with eyes the from the dead risen Jesus, for out of this overpowering experience had they first drawn the force to all further (Book 1, Chapter 31). This judgment hits today just so as in the year two hundred where it was spoken; yes, I assert: the existence of the Christianity proves the fact of the resurrection. As the Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians: "Is however Christ not raised, so is your faith in vain. … If we have nothing but the hope upon Christ in this life, so are we the most lamentable of all men" (1 Cor. 15, 17, 19). How the resurrection is to be thought, that is a wholly other question. I for my part join myself to one of the most significant heads among the contemporary German theologians, the critically and thoroughly free thinking Friedrich Loofs, and confess "that nobody can stretch himself with his thinking out over our until now experience: how that which the disciples experienced was possible, – that know I not. … I know it not and I hold not-knowing here not for truth-shyness" (The ResurrectionReports and their Value, 3rd ed., p. 40 ff.). True would it be of interest to know how the men who beheld the Risen one interpreted their vision; yet lets itself out of the reports nothing exact and especially nothing agreeing take: some describe circumstances that exclude a massive corporality, others emphasise precisely this. Only about one man's judgment know we exact information: the Apostle Paul writes in the same chapter in which he enumerates the appearances of the Risen one: "That however say I, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor inherits the decay the undecayability" (1 Cor. 15, 50), and still more of the like, and in his letter to the Philippians he distinguishes between the earthly "body of our humiliation" and the "body of the glory" of the risen Jesus (3, 21). It can thus underlie no doubt that this most significant among the first Christians thought not of a resurrection of the died body, but of the further-living in transfigured shape outside the to us familiar conditions of earthly existence (1 Cor. 15, 44 ff.). This confirms decisively a circumstance that many well overlook: Paul enumerates all appearances of the Risen one of which he knows in sequence (at the same place, Verse 5 ff.), mentions however with no syllable the empty grave nor the therewith hanging together visit of the women – the empty grave possessed thus for him no meaning, perhaps held he this narration for a pious legend. In order to overlook the connection and thus also rightly to judge, must one know and consider the following fact. We heard above of the malicious tale of the Jews that Christ's disciples had secretly removed his corpse out of the grave. Many a reader will have asked himself what this desecration of the grave-rest should have aimed at? The Semites and with them the Jews – at the coarse materialism that distinguishes their religious life from that of other men – are unable to present to themselves a future life if not the same body serves also further as carrier to this new life. I can for this cite the few days ago appeared work of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Plato (1919, 1, 335):

"Who for the Semitic thinking-kind is not fallen to the death, who thus is thought further working, must either together with his body be raised into the immortality, or together with his body be risen out of the death"; while the Hellene already at Homer's times was familiar with the idea of an "unsensual bodylessness," "can the Semite not loose himself from the bodily." In these ideas were the disciples of Christ together with their surroundings grown up; that may not be overlooked: for out of that first understands one the accusation of the Jews, and at the same time works this Jewish materialism upon the conception of the disciples of their experiences, in consequence also upon their presentation.

Paul however, as religious genius, who besides since early youth had stood under the influence of a Hellenistic environment, grasped, as we saw, the resurrection of Christ otherwise and needed for it no breaking-open of the grave-gate. True may Wilamowitz with the fine remark be right that Paul remains insofar materialist as the by him taught "pneumatic body," made out of "heavenly stuff," is still always a body; yet mean I he has therewith done so significant a step upon the way to the idealisation that one fairly could not expect more of him. Knownly has the Church not followed him, rather remained it caught in the coarse sensuality of Semitic half-thoughts. To the conclusion of this discussion serve a glorious word of Luther: "For we speak and confess this article (of the resurrection) in the prayer not therefore that it alone has happened, as we otherwise narrate a fable, fairy-tale or history; but that it in the heart become strong, true and living. And that name we faith when we so imagine it to ourselves that we wholly and completely stick ourselves into it, even as if otherwise nothing other were written than: Christ is risen!" And still one. Should a friend wish to hear my own confession, I would say to him the following. In that Jesus – insofar he was man, the perfectus homo of the ecclesiastical confessions – died, vanished he out of the world of the space and of the time, thereby also out of the history; "know" can I since the moment of his death nothing more about him, only believe. Precisely because I had the fortune to receive the schooling of the exact science and besides was instructed by Immanuel Kant "he had to abolish the knowledge in order to gain place for the faith" (Pure Reason, Pref. to 2nd ed., p. XXX). – Thanks to these both circumstances am I accustomed to distinguish with sharpness between knowledge and faith. What I believe stands in my mind still deeper anchored than that which I mean to know; it stands however at other place, under other laws, and it falls me in consequence hard to find myself into the heads of the uninstructed, as well as to grant them insight into my head, since the most possess about this distinction no clear idea. I know that the sun stands in the heaven; firmer and more certain and richer in content is however my faith in Jesus Christ as my Saviour. What Christ has brought to us is the faith in God: "If you knew me, so knew you also my Father" (John 8, 19). The oldest Christians have known that well, and we read for example in the Epistle to Diognetus: "For who under all men has, before Christ appeared, also only in the least known what God is?" God the unperceivable, unthinkable became in Christ visible and spoke as man to us audible words whose over-earthly sound tones to us today just so in the ears as to the men before two thousand years. As the Apostle Paul of the appearance of Christ says: "It let it day in our hearts to the shining rising of the knowledge and of the glory of God upon the face of Christ" (2 Cor. 4, 6). Jesus the revelation of God upon earth: that is the content of the "glad-message." That God does not die to the death is clear; the death can at highest redeem him out of the pressure of a temporarily assumed corporality: Jesus lives from ever to ever. Therefore designate I without hesitation the word "resurrection" as allegory; stand, arise, rise are concepts which presuppose a spatial world and a temporal determination; I explain to myself however the use of this allegory right well, already out of the above described Jewish thinking-kind, as well as also out of the need of the historical attachment to the just closed life. Should the disciples finally grasp the sense of this life, the sense of their enormous experience and thereby first be made capable for their world-historical office, so must Jesus appear to them and speak to them: for this necessity possess we the historical proof; for first out of this with nothing to compare event arose – as we already saw – the Christianity. About the kind however how these appearances are understanding-wise to interpret confess I my ignorance and confess that I hold every explanation from the outset for impossible and reject every dogmatic decision hereabout.

For this my conception appeal I still once to Origen; this one writes at a place of his De Principiis (Book 2, Chapter 6, Section 2) where he speaks of the flesh-becoming, the death and the resurrection: "With such things to turn oneself to human ears and to try to set them apart in words, that surpasses far the capacities of our understanding and of our language; yes, I am even of the opinion that it has surpassed the capacities of the holy apostles; probably are also the heavenly beings unable to grasp these mysteries thinking."

Between the unsearchable entry into the earthly existence and the of never to interpret mysteries surrounded exit out of this existence into another, to our understanding ungraspable, lies a short life that up to the last eight days – as soon as one looks at it from outside – world-distant and eventless runs; of no to us known religion-founder or reformer knows the history similar to report; rather see we men of this kind through inner soul-torments fight themselves through up to mighty decisions in order then to step out and upon the them surrounding world overturning to work – it be here only reminded of Buddha, Mohammed and Luther. With Jesus is neither of the passionate war in the own bosom nor of the overturn of existing institutions the speech. Would one throw in that we know so good as nothing about the first thirty years of this life and could therefore about the inner fights nothing state, I would contradict that: for there consists intimate connection between the inner soul-fights of the religionrenewers and the kind of their later violent deed-force: for the divine rest that from the beginning on must have filled Jesus' heart witnesses his silent enduring when the world finally had become attentive upon him and strove his death. True will we not estimate low the meaningful allegory of the temptation in the desert as unhistorical; yet precisely this kind to withdraw oneself in the hour of the temptation into the solitude, of the evil stirrings still determinedly to become master and then into the accustomed surroundings calmly to return witnesses of a heavenly harmony of the soul for which we possess no second example.

Every of us must now above all feel the commanding urge to call this heavenly harmony as it as personality walked upon earth – the "Son of Man" as it loved to designate itself – as living as possible before eyes; the whole Christianity roots in the with nothing to compare impression that this personality made upon some hundred men and left with them as source of immeasurable force. The many for whom Jesus Christ means a mere name, yet also not these alone, but also those who believe in him as Redeemer and worship him as God, divine not what is lacking to them as long as they lack the named idea. The Gospels, so gap-rich also their reports may be, harbour – and for him who understands not to read them, hide – a fullness of facts suited to bring the Saviour near and always nearer to us. Upon the question after the race-belonging of the families of Joseph and of Mary will I here not go in, first because it is unsolvable, second because we do well to revere the mystery of the birth of our Saviour [Footnote: What here about would be to say have I in the chapter "The Appearance of Christ" of my Foundations tried to summarise; in a historical work was such a discussion in place. Add will I only that a learned specialist, Professor Haupt in Baltimore, since then has spoken the conjecture that Mary and Joseph were after the race Aryan Medes, which he especially grounds therewith that the inhabitants of Galilee after the majority were Medes. (This communication take I out of the work of the English theologian Mac Clymont: New Testament Criticism, its history and results, 1913, p. 150.) – Meanwhile is the writing of Delitzsch The Great Deception (1920) appeared in which we read p. 94: "Jesus' parents and ancestors were as Galileans after Old-Testament as well as cuneiform testimony quite certainly not of Jewish blood, but belonged to the great number of Galilean Jewish proselytes. That Jesus was no prophet of Jewish blood teaches his to the Jewish diametrically opposed Godconcept and confirm all his speeches together with his whole life and dying."]. It suffices us to know that the Saviour true was educated in the Israelite faith, yet not lived in a surroundings that one in the narrower sense of the word could name "Jewish." The inhabitants of Galilee (of the "heathen-district") formed a essentially other stamp of men than the Jews of Judea, stood also politically under another government; they distinguished themselves through work-lust, cheerful mind-kind, energetic independence-sense – which they in their repeated uprisings heroically proved.

"A Galilean and a determined man means in the Jewish language-use the same," remarks Herder. The Jews have never recognised the Galileans as full-Jews; to them was for example the public reading at the God-service within Judea forbidden; their pronunciation be so neglected – so was mocked – that one at a definite word know not whether the Galilean speaks of wine, of wool, of an ass or of a lamb (Lightfoot: Galatians, p. 197). Under these men has now Jesus lived his life and under them found his adherents – the first mediators of the Christian faith. "Good was it," writes Herder, "that Christ far from Judea and the proud Jerusalem, although only short time, drove his business in this province (Galilee); there would one not have granted him also this short time. Here spoke he with the common, a lively people, with men of healthy understanding, at their businesses. Also his more intimate pupils had he chosen himself out of these regions …" (Of the Redeemer of the Men, Section 3, Abs. 9). Every man knows the places of the Gospels in which Jesus and his adherents are mocked as "Galileans," and A. Merx beholds in the speech of Caiaphas (John 11, 19–50) a sign therefor that the high-priest regarded the Saviour "not as a full-Israelite" (The Four Canonical Gospels, Final Volume, p. 299). To the fact of this Galilean surroundings is however, as one sees, the usual idea of the Saviour as a Jew in the Jew-land by no means just. Even apart from the main-shape conditioned the kind of the counter-effect another life in Galilee than it in Judea would have been the case, and determined thus the starting-point of the Christianity. Heed we further that the Saviour grew up upon the land (Nazareth was a village), in the midst of a healthy farmer-people, in a richly blessed, laughing beautiful region, – far thus from all city-misery and – as said – outside the landscape-wise comfortlessly desolate homeland of the actual Jews, Judea. Enough for the time about the outer conditions under which the personality made itself known; turn we ourselves to the inward. Something that would equal an enumerating description of pure human traits finds itself in the Gospels nowhere; nevertheless discovers the attentive reader numerous pointings, sufficient in order, if not an executed portrait, yet a definite impression – material for rich after-thinking – to gain. We find there utterances of the joy, of the pain, of the compassion, of the astonishment, of the despair; great passionateness radiates out of various sayings, for example: "I am come to throw a fire upon the earth, and what would I rather than that it already burned!" (Luke 12, 49); yes, early texts report even of upwellings of the raging and becoming-angry; so sounds for example Mark 8, 12 in the oldest of all known manuscripts (by the science named Syrsin): "And he became in the spirit angry," and in other old texts: "He raged in his spirit." Unfortunately are the most of these small pure human traits by later pious editors erased – not out of the conscious intention to falsify the text, but out of the concern that all-too human traits could do break to the reverence before the God; in the above case for example read we today: "He sighed up in his spirit." In the scientific books finds one examples enough of this gradual down-toning of originally present colours. How much however that one still can discover who approaches the texts not with cold scepticism but with loving knowledge-curiosity proves at best the section with Burkitt about a certain bitter cheerfulness or "mournful irony" that with the Saviour often breaks through and was grasped neither by his disciples nor by their followers, since this mind-mood remained wholly foreign to that of the early Christianity in that it points upon a superior freedom of the spirit: Burkitt has especially the place at Luke 22, 35 ff. in mind where the Saviour at the evening of the taking-prisoner recommends to his disciples the purchase of swords as if he intended to rely upon weapon-force (Gospel Transmission, Chapter 4). Even about daily habits experience we many things: so for example the love to the solitude (Mark 1, 45), the rising at day-break in order quietly out of the midst of the sleeping disciples to slip away to the unguided early-walk over the fields (Mark 1, 38) or up upon a height (Mark 3, 13), so that the astonished and apparently offended adherents have trouble to find their Master; another time in order to escape the touches of the crowd jumps Jesus quickly into a boat and lets push off from the shore (Mark 3, 10). Deeper than these observations leads us into the essence of the Saviour the immersion into his language: upon this way arrive we stage-wise always more into the inward. The speaking in parables is true in the Orient usual; yet comes it with Jesus not upon the parables alone – so unexampled and inimitable also these flowed out of his mouth – rather speaks he also outside the actual parables almost always in pictures, and these pictures are borrowed from the observation of the nature and of the human work upon the land.

Already before two and a half centuries has a man whose capacity to "objective" judgment even the doubter will not deny, Sir Isaac Newton, in his Commentary about the Book Daniel pointed upon this distinguishing peculiarity of the language of the Saviour who instead of – as the Orientals – dramatically-effectful and quite frequently bombastic comparisons to draw near always with perfected simplicity attaches to that which lies before eyes to him and his companions: to all knows he to gain meaning – also to the sparrow upon the roof and the anemone upon the field. And what Newton, the astronomer and physicist, with his sharp eye had observed, that has our contemporary F. Crawford Burkitt – acknowledgedly the most significant among the living theologians of England – upon ground of his specialist knowledge confirmed: the entire literature can exhibit nothing that in regard to thought- and expression-style also only in the most distant would possess similarity with the parables of Jesus (The Gospel History and its Transmission, Chapter 6). First effects the perfection in the picture-ness of the speaking-way that the single word in a certain sense loses at meaning, – insofar namely as the thoughts lie wholly and completely in the pictures – not properly in the words which mediate the pictures –: out of that follows now however a circumstance that for the preservation and further-effect of the words of the Saviour has possessed decisive meaning and still today lends them a freshness as if they were spoken yesterday. The smaller the value that comes to the oratorical, the logical-dialectical at a linguistic communication, and the more perfected plastic-visible the expression stands before eyes, the easier will it fall to the hearers to render not wordtrue, well however matter-true reports about the once heard: the words may they forget, the pictures remain engraved to the memory. Who in Burkitt's before cited book attentively considers the chapter in which this scholar lays before thirty-one manifoldly testified Lord-words in their various versions will with astonishment discover that these differences – which partly concern the word-sound, partly the accompanying circumstances under which a saying was done – exercise little or at all no remodel influencing upon the in a parable communicated truth. The pictures had been so plastic and penetrating that they remained unerasable hanging in the memory; and upon them came it. The same circumstance explains it that the genuine sayings of the Saviour can be translated into all languages of the world without losing of their effect-force; against that for example it falls very hard to bring the sense of many executions of the Apostle Paul without help of the Greek original-text exactly to the understanding, and just so must also his out of the then life of a Greek harbour-city and of the thoughtworld of the Hellenistic mystery-religions taken pictures without explanation remain ununderstandable. Jesus' words – mediated through his pictures – remain accessible to all times and peoples: "Heaven and earth will pass away; my words however will not pass away." One sees: already the mere immersion into the language of Jesus teaches us much about him – and indeed far more important than a chronicle of his earth-days could offer; for at this life comes it uniquely upon soul-beholding. And at the word soul-beholding falls me in that a second mathematician, equal to Newton in meaning, Blaise Pascal, has pointed us the way out of the speaking-way of the Saviour to a still deeper glance (pia fraus). First would it be more than remarkable if the Saviour in the all-last moment and without every explanation had presented to his disciples a new teaching. Second would it be ungraspable that so decisive a teaching finds neither with one of the other evangelists nor in any of the remaining writings of the New Testament an echo – for the unique other place in the entire New Testament which mentions the three-unity, Verse 7 of the 5th chapter of the first epistle of John, is so late and flagrant a falsification that even still under Leo XIII a by him appointed scholars-commission must confirm the unauthenticity; of four hundred known Greek manuscripts that reach from the 4th to the 14th century contains no unique the concerning words, also to the oldest exemplars of the Vulgate of Jerome are they foreign. Third: we possess in the New-Testament writings and also outside them numerous testimonies about the baptism-act with the early Christians and know that under them without exception "upon the name of Christ" or "upon the name of the Lord" was baptised. So says for example Peter in his first great sermon (Acts 2, 38): "Let each of you be baptised upon the name of Jesus Christ," and to the converted Roman captain Cornelius and his family commands he "to let themselves be baptised upon the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 10, 48).

These examples let themselves be multiplied, against which no unique can be named at which the baptism "upon the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" would have been performed; first in the course of the second century seems the trinitarian formula to have come up, and indeed, as Cheyne believes, introduced out of Africa (see Bible problems).

Fourth: we know through John that the Saviour himself was not accustomed to baptise (4, 2), and from Paul possess we the word: "Christ has not sent me out to baptise, but to proclaim the Gospel" (1 Cor. 1, 17), out of which we with certainty take that to the apostles a baptism-command out of the mouth of Jesus was unknown. Fifth: the known earliest history-writer of the Church, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (active around the middle of the fourth century), contemporary and protégé of Constantine the Great, mentions in his writings precisely this place of the Matthew-Gospel more than a dozen times, never however (at least in no writing that arose before the Council of Nicaea) in the to us familiar version, but with following word-sound: "Go thither and win all peoples in my name and teach them etc." Eusebius thus read at this place (and he had from his predecessor Pamphilus an especially rich collection of manuscripts inherited) neither a baptism-command at all nor the proclamation of a three-unity-teaching (see Conybeare: History of New Testament Criticism, Chapter 5, and Wellhausen: The Gospel of Matthew, p. 152). It proves itself thus this verse as undoubted unauthentic; we will not let ourselves through it be made err. The Saviour's God-teaching – that is thus the teaching of the Father – sets itself together out of two elements: childlike simplicity and unfathomable deep-sense. The one element conditions the other: for who grasps God's essence too deep than that he confuses myth with reality, and too little materialistic than that he finds sufficiency at the idea of a "maker of the all," to him remains nothing over than either with the Indian wise one (p. 28) to be silent, or however out of childlike pure mind as of a dream-vision to speak; this speaking however can in any case only be born out of that silence. We have already in the first chapter seen that about God nothing can be stated that before the understanding would possess logical-compelling validity and sense, because – already after the concept – God belongs not to the world of the appearance and thus all that is stated of him and about him is only improperly to understand. I remind of the word of Luther's: "Yes, who knows what is that which God means? It is over body, over spirit, over all that one can say, hear and think." Extremely characteristic is it therefore that the Saviour never undertakes a teaching-like setting-apart about the essence of God, that he rather through hundred seemingly lightly thrown remarks gradually initiates us into his own relation to "his and our Father," in order out of that to let each one guess or gradually after-feel or divine or as through sudden revelation grasp what and who this Father is "for whose sake he lives" (John 6, 57), and whose never yielding presence frees him out of all cares of the earthly existence so completely that he already within this temporality inhabits the extra-temporal "kingdom of God" as his true homeland. About a thus grasped God can there be no forced faith-article (dogma): he is experienced, or he is not experienced; speak, teach, in church-councils hither and thither about him dispute – that all is excluded. Who will experience this God of our Saviour – the Father – must listen upon the Saviour's voice: no other is able here to mediate. May also none presume thereof, it will yet not be forbidden to lead the still unpractised to the attending in that one highlights some main-points. Striking is for example the decided tone in which Jesus himself repeatedly clearly rejects from himself his equal-setting with the Father; for the authenticity of such places witnesses the fact that they soon fell painfully upon the Church and we in the Gospels themselves already meet attempts to remodel or to eradicate them. The most striking of these places sounds: "and when he came out upon the street, ran one thereto and fell before him upon the knees, and asked him: Good Master, what shall I do in order to inherit eternal life? Jesus however said to him: What name you me good? Nobody is good except the one God" (Mark 10, 17, 18). This word brings Luke in exactly the same version (18, 19) and, what is very important, Justin the Martyr – about around the middle of the second century – cites it (Apol. I, 16, 7). No man was able to invent such a word which contradicted the ideas of the becoming Church; the ecclesiastical working of the Matthew-Gospel transformed it then later into the embarrassed version: "Master, what shall I do good…?", whereupon the answer follows: "What ask you me about that which is good? One is the Good" (19, 16 ff.).

A second hereto belonging word heard we already before (p. 102) where the Saviour, asked about the time-point of the world-end, replies he knows it not, that knows "alone the Father": also this word has the Church done the possible to erase or to strike; to the luck has the Mark-text preserved it to us pure.

Who exactly attends thereupon will at many places remark similar, yet I pass them over, not merely in order not to tire, but because Matthew, Mark and Luke all three bring a word which carries through the distinction between the Saviour and the Father into the innermost stirrings of the will: I mean the prayer upon the oil-mountain that closes with the words: "Yet not my will, but Thy will happen!" Clearer can not be distinguished between personality and personality. A second main-point in Jesus' God-teaching have we therein to behold that he claims the picture of the sonship not for himself alone, rather always anew applies it upon all men who believe in the Father: who feels God as Father can not otherwise than recognise himself as son. "Nobody upon the earth shall you name your Father; for One is your Father, the heavenly" (Matt. 23, 9). This idea of a relation of the man to God as that of the child to his father was through the Saviour under his disciples so firm naturalised that it, when the new God-teaching of the young Church came up, lived further and still Paul can write: "For those who are driven through God's Spirit, those are God's sons" (Rom. 8, 14). More important however than all other is the witness-ship of John who true writes late, yet precisely in these questions had known his Master more intimately and better understood than any other man, and he is it who transmits to us the eternally memorable words: "I rise up to my and your Father, to my and your God" (John 20, 17). Scarcely less noteworthy – especially opposite the still today generally ruling prejudice – is a third point in the God-teaching of the Saviour: the fact namely that the God whom he designates as "Father" is never confused with the Jew-god, just as little as Jahve's chosen people of the Jews appears preferred by him.

Unwillingly interrupt I our consideration about the religion of the kingdom of God, yet is it unconditionally necessary – precisely in order to understand the teaching of the Saviour – to know and rightly to judge his relation to the Jewish faith. One grant therefore a short digression about this object. First must the tone strike in which the Saviour is accustomed to speak about the Jews. Once over the other are they by him with annihilating irony led away. At opportunity of the meeting with the Roman captain speaks Jesus: "Truly, I say to you, with nobody in Israel have I found such faith … and they will come from morning and evening and midnight and midday and will sit at table in the kingdom of God … the sons of the kingdom however (that is the Jews) will be thrown out into the darkness outside …" (Matt. 8, 10 ff., Luke 13, 29). Still more definite says it at other place: "The kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a people which brings fruits" (Matt. 21, 43). Deep impression makes an expression that in the most manuscripts – well because of its terrifying truthfulness – was a little mitigated, that however the Syrsin, the Codex Bezae and other good manuscripts have transmitted to us unchanged: there read we Mark 3, 5, the Saviour was "over the deadness (nekrosis) of the hearts of the Jews grieved – or (after some sources) angered." Perhaps has no opponent of the Jews ever spoken so bitter a judgment: dead hearts! And still a decisive word possess we through which he excludes the Jews from his message in that he speaks to them: "If I speak truth, why believe you me not? Who is out of God hears the words of God. Therefore hear you it not, because you are not out of God" (John 8, 46 ff.). At the false position of our churches to the Judaism is our clergy accustomed either to silence such words or it hurries as light-footed as possible over them away; one knows Kant's mockery about the quality of our religion-instruction: "One should believe every Christian must be a Jew" (Rel., p. 252). And so is then held before us by our theologians at every opportunity the small sentence-part that upon unexplainable sneaking-ways has been smuggled into the conversation with the Samaritan woman: "because the weal is from the Jews" (John 4, 22) – words that Kreyenbühl with right has designated "as one of the most tasteless and most impossible glosses that ever have not only distorted a genuine text but reversed into its straight opposite" (after Merx). The same man who lets the Saviour speak to the Jews the words: "You are not out of God," should ascribe to him another time the utterance: "the weal comes from the Jews"!

And even in the connection of this conversation with the Samaritan woman whose content consists in the proclamation that the "Father" will no more be worshipped in Jerusalem, rather is God – in opposition to Jahve – "Spirit," and "he demands such worshippers who worship in spirit and truth," – a conversation that throws the Jewish Messiah-concept over the heap and ends with the explanation Jesus is "the Saviour of the world" (soter tou kosmou)! In his Revelation names John the Jews "a synagogue of the Satan" (2, 9): one believes to behold a member of this synagogue as it into one of the most liberating texts of the Gospel blacks in such a the whole connection falsifying lie. For the Saviour's own mood opposite the "prophet-murderers" (Matt. 23, 32) witness – apart from the many own utterances – the hard words of Paul whose heart yet always again beats for the Jewish tribecomrades so that when he condemns them we have to see a success of the instruction through Jesus; he says now of the Jews: "They please not God and are to all men contrary" (1 Thess. 2, 15) and at other place – where he has in mind the activity of allegedly converted Jews within the Christian community – calls he out the warning worth to be heard through all centuries: "Have heed upon the dogs, upon the evil workers, have heed upon the cutting-asunder!" (Phil. 3, 2).

Out of this relation of Jesus to the Jews finds one himself from the outset inclined to presuppose a not very deep-going and binding relation to their faith-building; and indeed with right; for the generally spread idea that our Saviour was a pious Jew belongs to the fables convenues of our theologians. Possessed we no further proofs, the one consideration would already suffice to our enlightenment: how should That One whose whole essence was pure religion have found sufficiency at a faith that distinguishes itself through a minimum-measure of "religion" under all. (((Moses Mendelssohn))) – the knowing Jew – writes in his "Rescue of the Jews," appeared 1782: "The Judaism is not revealed religion, but revealed law-giving"; and Immanuel Kant – the just one – instructs us: "The Judaism, as such, contains, taken in its purity, at all no religion-faith"; words that are supplemented through following explanation: "The Judaism is properly at all no religion, but merely unification of a multitude of men who, since they belonged to a special tribe, formed themselves to a common being under merely political laws, thus not to a church … That the name of God is revered makes this stateconstitution not to a religion-constitution" (Religion p. 186 ff.). In particular about Jahve and the ten commandments says it then at the same place further: "A God who merely wills the following of such commandments, thereto at all no improved moral disposition is required, is yet properly not that moral being whose concept we need for a religion." It would be superfluous here to waste many words if not the men rooted so untearably firm in their prejudices, also where such violate against all reason and all eye-appearance. So is then here always again the one unique place, Matthew 5, 17–20, led before as compelling proof for the Saviour's true Jewish disposition, since he hereafter would have said "he is not come to dissolve the Jewish law," rather "shall also not a jot or a little hook of the law pass away until the heaven and the earth pass away." This word shall we hold for genuine and unambiguous, notwithstanding it not alone contradicts all teachings of the Saviour, but also is at once abolished by the immediately thereafter following text. About that equal more; pre-sent be however the remark that here a complicated case lies before: it is a matter not merely of ecclesiastical text-changes, but also in the genuine text of specifically Jewish concepts which only through explanation out of the time-relations receive a sense, and indeed a sense that reverses the meaning that we of today read out into its opposite. Many theologians hold the verses 18 and 19 for insertions and read accordingly: "Think not that I am come to dissolve the law or the prophets; not to dissolve am I come, but to fulfil. For I say to you, if it with your justice is not more than with the scripture-scholars and Pharisees, so will you by no means come into the kingdom of the heavens" (so for example Archdeacon W. C. Allen in his excellent commentary to the Matthew Gospel).

This solution is a very simple, and if it suffices to a high ecclesiastical dignity-carrier, so may the layman calm himself thereby; yet confess I that the thorough investigation that Adalbert Merx in his great work about The Four Canonical Gospels dedicates to this place and that leads to another judgment convinces me more: Merx holds the verses 18 and 19 (in their oldest to presuppose version) for genuine, but from of old for misunderstood, because the knowledge of the Jewish relations soon lacked to the earlier Christians. Earnest seekers refer I to this treatise whose learning and thoroughness by a much surpass the claims that I may place to my readers. A unique paragraph share I: "That were the states that in the circles of the scripture-scholars and law-teachers soon after Jesus really ruled, and when he, whom all name Rabbi, publicly worked, so was that which the people expected nothing other than practical law-explanation, loosening and binding in the Jewish sense, and precisely that rejects he Matt. 5, 17 from himself. This activity is a subordinate whose necessity vanishes simultaneously with the beginning of the heaven-kingdom that Jesus brings, that however will exist – not must – as long as the kingdom of Jesus is not there. Therefore says he that of the law no jot vanishes, 'until All becomes,' then however vanishes it and a higher steps to its place whose principles he has developed in the following. Now sees one how perfectly skewed the gloss is that this law shall last until heaven and earth pass away; and how Christian interpreters can always again defend this text without to remark into which self-contradictions they fall, that would be ungraspable if one knew not that the evil habit also with the best logic is not to remove." Without now further to let ourselves in upon disputed text-questions, attend we only upon the undisputed verse 17 in which the Saviour says he is "not come to dissolve, but to fulfil": this fulfilling (Greek plerosai, Latin adimplere) offers an outstanding example of that earnest smiling irony upon which Burkitt before made us attentive; for, as the immediately following shows, fulfils the Saviour the Jewish law in that he contradicts it and abolishes it. "You have heard, it is said to the ancients, you shall not kill; who however kills shall be fallen to the judgment (and that means to the death). I however say to you, every who without ground is angry to his brother shall be fallen to the judgment [Footnote: The word "without ground" brings the oldest text.]. … You have heard, it is said, you shall not commit adultery. I however say to you, every who looks after a woman in lustfulness has already broken the marriage with her in his heart." Upon this way is a commandment after the other transformed out of an outer behaviour-measure into an inner heart-driving-spring; thereby remains it however not: many are reversed into their opposite, so for example the "eye for eye" and the commandment "You shall hate your enemy" – for which Jesus teaches: "love your enemies!" Yes, the most important Jewish laws – the hallowing of the Sabbath and the food-ordinances – are without further abolished. "The Sabbath is there for the sake of the man, and not the man for the sake of the Sabbath" (Mark 2, 27) – an utterance to which one of the best and oldest Greco-Latin manuscripts as decisive important supplement brings words that the Saviour directs to a man whom he meets working upon the field on the Sabbath: "Man, if you know what you do, are you blessed, if you know it not, are you a transgressor of the law and cursed!" Clearer can the negation of an earlier life-law and the introduction of a wholly new worldview not be spoken. In the same sense liberating works the abolition of the food-laws: "And he called the crowd thereto and said to them: hear to and grasp it! Not that which goes into the mouth defiles the man, but that which goes out of the mouth, that defiles the man" (Matt. 15, 10 ff.) – whereto still the explanation comes: what goes to the mouth comes into the belly; what however goes forth out of the mouth, that comes out of the heart, and that defiles the man. – All this means an immediate opposition to the "religion" of the Jews, namely to their law that they regard as God-given; it abolishes the law. Not less clearly shows itself the rejection of the Judaism in the repeated, mercilessly sharp appearing of the Saviour against the Pharisees and the scripture-scholars; never falls over them, out of this otherwise forbearing mouth, a reconciling word. They are named "snakes" and "adder-brood." "Woe to you, scripture-scholars and Pharisees, you hypocrites, who are equal as the white-washed graves which outwardly appear pretty, but inwardly are they full of dead-bones and all filth!" (Matt. 23, 25).

Now know we however exactly that the Pharisees in and for themselves were no bad men, rather in religious relation the best under the Jews, insofar they took their faith earnestly; this party corresponded about to the ecclesiastically orthodox under us, and scripture-scholars were named the exact knowers of the law, are thus to compare with our specialist theologians. Emil Schürer, in all lands estimated as the first knower of the concerning relations, writes: "This party is the actual core-people that distinguishes itself from the remaining mass only through greater strictness and consequence"; and at other place says he: "The Pharisaism is the legitimate and classical representative of the post-exilic Judaism at all. It has only with ruthless energy drawn the consequences out of its principles. Only those are the true Israel who observe the law upon the most punctual. Since this in the full sense only the Pharisees do, so are only they the actual Israel" (History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 4th ed. 2, 456 and 472). As one thus sees, when Jesus rejects the Pharisaism with indignation from himself and brands his adherents as "tearing wolves in sheep-clothes," so rejects he therewith "the actual Israel" from himself. Not can he have the harmless single ones in mind, rather abhors he the whole Jewish faith-system that he designates as a plant "that the heavenly Father has not planted" and that therefore "shall be rooted out" (Matt. 15, 13). Under no other assumption can his over-exceedingly sharp condemnation of the then conversion-activity of the Jews be grasped. Mocking and scourging calls he out: "You traverse sea and mainland in order to make a unique proselyte; and becomes he it, so make you out of him a son of the hell, twice so bad as you" (Matt. 23, 15). One may assert, the Jewish conception of God and of the relation of the man to his God – as it in the Pharisaism gains its purest expression – forms in all the exact opposition and counter-pole to that which the Saviour teaches. As Kant before made us attentive, and as one from every competent scholar can experience, is the so-called Jewish law a collection of pure formal, outer, mechanical and hair-raising arbitrary commandments, without a spark of soul-life, thus without all actual religion. Who acted against none of the commandments was named a just one – might he be a still so bad man; after the inner heart-stirring is at all not asked, but merely thereafter whether a prescription is transgressed or not – who against that leaves the most insignificant and most senseless prescription out of heed is a sinner. Wellhausen – one of the most reliable specialist scholars of our time – judges about the pious Jews: "They will not do good, but guard themselves before sin; their observation of conventional statutes comes to nobody for good and delights neither gods nor men" (Isr. Jud. History, 3rd ed., 376). And now ask I, what has that for a sense when one speaks of Jesus of Nazareth as of a faithful believing Jew, of him who in all and every teaches the exact opposite, to whom the heart-disposition is all, who fears God not as law-giver but loves as Father, and expects the God-kingdom not (as the Jews) as future all-rule of the Jewish people upon earth, rather finds it inward in the heart of good men? I hold this generally spread assertion not alone for false, but for light-minded and for such misleading that it makes the understanding of the religion of the Saviour impossible. From birth was Jesus Galilean and as such from house out grown up in the Jewish faith; his opposition to the Judaism led him to the cross! Freed from the Jewish nightmare, return we to the Saviour's teaching of the Father and his kingdom and call out with Paul: "Rejoice yourselves in the Lord at all time; still once say I it, rejoice yourselves: the Lord is near!" (Phil. 4, 4 ff.). The method of the "neti, neti!" – he is not so, and he is not so – that we already in the first chapter learned to know, may not be under-estimated; in that we followed it, gained we now more decisive results: the God of whom Jesus speaks is not the historical Jahve, the God who selects himself a robber-folk-little in the desert, the "Lord of the host-crowds" (for whom our clergy display a never drying preference), he is however also not the three-unity God of our faith-confession, – no word of the Saviour points hereupon: we heard him repeatedly reject his equal-setting with God – (p. 108 ff.) and on the other side ascribe the sonship to all believing men (p. 109). I intend hereby by no means to combat the faith-articles of the church-founders and refer rather to the presentiment-full word of Paul: "God was it who in Christ reconciled the world with himself" (2 Cor. 5, 19) – what the Vulgate a little deviate renders: deus erat in Christo, mundum reconcilians sibi.

In the connection of this chapter have I however merely that in mind which the Saviour himself, after the testimony of the Gospels, teaches us about God, and there must I as undisputed fact establish that he rejects all other and as affirming content of this concept gifts us uniquely and alone the idea of the fatherly – an idea that he becomes not tired to repeat and so manifold, so tender, so rich to shape out that it seems to fill out the whole visible and invisible world and we, as long as the Saviour speaks, miss nothing and know nothing more to demand; as long stand just our hearts under a magic that lends them that childlikeness which Jesus demands of his hearers (Matt. 18, 3); later however raise understanding and reason their unsuppressible demands, and the simple idea of the "Father" suffices these claims not. There step then a Paul and in his following hundred church-fathers up and erect the thousand-pillared faith-temple of the Church within which the willing man feels himself sheltered, while many a more living soul as a captured bird wounds the wings upon the dogmatic lattice: the Father of whom the Saviour spoke, as well as his kingdom, are vanished from the glances! Now comfort us – as we already above saw (p. 102 ff.) – the theologians with the assurance that Jesus Christ has left behind at all no teaching, and instead of exactly listening upon his message of the Father, they remove us our mediator and gift us faith-confessions which surpass the grasping-force of every man-brain. I fear almost, if Jesus came again to earth, he would still once ward them off with the words: "Woe to you, scripture-scholars! who close the kingdom of God before the men; you come not therein, and those who will therein, let you not go therein!" In all earnest is the God-teaching of Christ reproached – or at least of it asserted –, it forms in its childlike simplicity and at its lack of strict consequent and systematically building-up connection nothing further than a picture-rich stimulation for men out of the people. So lies for example before me the book of an English specialist, Professor James Orr, about The Christian View of God and the World, in which the actual teaching of the Saviour is shortly dismissed as "wholly bare of all metaphysical content" and in the essential agreeing with the God-teaching of the Old Testament (p. 77 ff.)! In reality is – as already above remarked (p. 107) – the Saviour's teaching of God and the God-kingdom just so unfathomable at deep-sense as divine at simplicity – yes, these both properties belong inseparably to one another. It is not easy to find from elsewhere an enlightening example for that which hereby shall be said; perhaps however may we esteem Immanuel Kant worthy in this connection to be named: also with him agree deep-sense and naive thinking-kind. More than once makes he attentive thereupon that the deepest result of his afterthinking – in opposition to all other philosophy – has the peculiar at itself "so simple and natural to be that it is appropriate to the commonest man-sense as soon as this only once is led thereupon" (Pure Reason, 2nd ed., p. 617): the finest, most prudent dissection of the man-mind – a work that also merely to after-think deters the most – hits again exactly together with the so-called healthy manunderstanding, only that the reflection with Kant stands upon a far higher plane, what brings with itself the invaluable preference not alone of the consciousness, of the grounding and of the clarity, but especially – in consequence of these achievements – of the unshakable security against the reason constantly threatening danger of the nonsense, of the madness and of the deceit. Highest noteworthy remains in all cases this agreement between the true simplicity and the truthful deep-sense: is the simplicity not pure, but artificial or otherwise clouded, and is it not a matter of deepest reflection, but of sharpness and learning, so finds the named agreement not place. Our Saviour understand we not as long as the insight lacks to us that with him in a measure for which we otherwise possess no example simplicity and deep-sense melt together to a complete unity. That Jesus who names God so frequently restricts himself almost exclusively to the picture of the Father and at highest still lightly points upon his goodness, mercy, care etc. – properties that are anyhow contained in the Father-concept –, witnesses of the deep-sense and for the deep-sense of his God-teaching.

All that we otherwise state about God, what we attach to him at perfections, restricts him in reality and draws him down to us men in that it encloses him into the boundary-walls of our understanding.

We have already above with some thoroughness treated about that (p. 99 ff.) and seen in that this kingdom is presented completely "transcendent" (extra-worldly), bound to no space – one will not say "See here or there is it" –, nor to any time; rather is it present to the knowing and can every moment surprise the unknowing. Also in this case is, in spite of the unambiguity of the texts, from all beginning on much happened to the re-interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. The fact that the Jews expected a kingdom of Jahve upon earth seduced already the immediate disciples to confusions; soon stepped thereto the always more space-taking idea of a kingdom of God in the heaven whereto the man after his death, in a more or less transfigured corporality, hoped to arrive – and indeed not immediately at his death, but at the "world-end"; finally grasped – stimulated through the during centuries widely spread work of Augustine, De Civitate Dei – the thought with many foot that the kingdom of God is the kingdom of the the world ruling Catholic Church. It needs opposite my readers scarcely the proof that none of these ideas touches itself at any point with the teaching of the Saviour of the kingdom "that lies inward in us." Yet, in order to let this still more convincingly feel, will we throw a glance upon the Saviour's position-taking opposite the fact of the sin – a position-taking that remains wholly ununderstandable as long as his teachings of God and the God-kingdom in their simplicity and their deep-sense have not been grasped. One may open which theological book one will, always will one find the author embarrassed and secretly horrified thereover that Jesus makes little of the sin; so quick as it goes are the theologians accustomed to hurry further over this to them questionable fact in order soonest to arrive at Paul and the early Christians where they again feel themselves at home in the atmosphere of the sin, of the sin-forgiveness and of the redemption out of the sin-debt. The good and the evil, the virtue and the guilt knew all peoples; yet the juristically sharp working-out of the concept of the sin is the work in first rank of the Egyptians, then however especially of the Jews from whom we have taken it over. And indeed hangs the sin inseparably tight together with the concept of the God-given law. A God who, as the Jewish, has issued numerous laws that encompass the entire life and impose upon the men duties over duties, creates therewith at the same time the sins that the law shall ward off. Paul writes: "The sin would not have come to knowledge to me if not through the law. Had I yet also of the lust known nothing if the law had not said: Let thyself not lust; the sin however has used the commandment in order to call all lusts in me into the life; for without law lacks the sin the life" (Rom. 7, 7 ff.). In the sequence took the sin an increasing broader space in the thought-world of the Christian Church until then finally "through Augustine the consciousness of the general sinfulness has become the exclusive negative ground-mood of the Christianity" (Harnack, D. G., 4th ed., 1, 71). Which enormous meaning the idea of the sin possesses in Martin Luther's religious life knows every one: "The sin steps us with feet," writes he out of most own experience, "until that the grace comes and steps the sin with feet." And in our days has the theologian under the theologians, Albrecht Ritschl, set up the sentence "the value of the performance of Christ and the unvalue of the sin" are "thoroughly correlative sizes," that is equal to one another at meaning (Justification and Reconciliation, 4th ed., 1, 217). Nowhere now falls the un-Jewish and against-Jewish at our Saviour more upon than at the question of the sin; also stands he thereby in an expressed opposition to all Christian churches – which yes all treat the sin and the justification as middle-point and as driving-force of the by them taught religions. Against that is it for Jesus characteristic that he in general prefers the sinners to the just ones – a striking fact that Luther thus explains: "It happens so that the honour wholly is laid to God the Lord, therefore that he out of grace and pure mercy forgives the sin" (Concordance 4, 296). Every one must however feel how insufficient this explanation is that stands strong under the influence of Old Testament idea. Also the answer that Jesus himself occasionally of a reproach about his traffic with "sinners" grants: "Not the strong need the physician, but the sick; … not just ones to call am I come, but sinners" (Matt. 9, 12 ff.) – this answer carries more the character of a defence than that of a to the ground going information: first is the expression "just ones" Jewish to understand, and the saying means thus one of the many rejections of the Jewish law; yet prove numerous words, especially in the parables, that still a deeper sense lies hidden therein. The Saviour pursues a unique goal: to introduce the men into the kingdom of God; this happens by means of an enlightenment of the mind, accompanied by a turn of the will; and now finds it itself that "sinners" are more receptive for the

enlightenment and more ready-willing to the will-turn than "non-sinners." The religion of Jesus stands just – as already executed – outside the time and asks therefore only after the present: this extinguishes the past, respectively transforms its meaning in the now.

The criminal who dying directs to the Saviour the words "Think of me" is subjected to no interrogation, nor is a penance imposed upon him in this side or in the beyond, rather says it: "Truly, I say to thee, today wilt thou be with me in the paradise" (Luke 23, 42 ff.). In the moment where the turn takes place are his misdeeds extinguished: "For I am not come to judge the world, but to save the world" (John 12, 47). If the case of the robber – as a quite too special – not convinces or is doubted, so consider one that of the adulteress (whom, characteristically, the Church has done its best to strike out of the text – compare Merx and Rendel Harris). After upon the word of the Saviour: "who under you is without sin, that one throw the first stone," the accusers have gradually sneaked away, speaks Jesus to the adulteress: "So condemn also I thee not; go thither and sin from now on not more" (John 8, 2–11). Even if that hit what some scholars suspect, here lay a parable before, not an event, the word itself – and thereupon alone comes it – belongs to the undoubtable; for it means a blow into the face not alone of all Jewish law-giving and feeling, but not less of every Christ-church teaching and custom from the first times on up to the present day. The sin is simply not reckoned to the woman; of repentance, penance and punishment hear we likewise nothing; "sin from now on not more": that suffices. To this example attaches itself purposefully a further. The Saviour sits at table with a rich man; there steps a because of her unchaste life city-known "sinful woman" thereto, falls before the Saviour upon the knees, "lets not off to kiss him the feet," and anoints them then to him with well-smelling oil; thereover graspable indignation of the house-owner and of his guests and astonishment that the Saviour does not reject from himself the touch of such a woman. This one however takes her into protection and proclaims: "Her many sins are forgiven, for she has much loved," and to the woman speaks he: "Thy faith has helped thee; go thither in peace" (Luke 7, 36–50). One look also further around and heed in which measure various sayings and especially parables of the Saviour in regard to the sin run contrary to our ecclesiastical moralsteachings and at all to the under us spread ideas about morality. Were for example the word not from child's bones familiar, it must startle every one when he hears: "So will joy be in the heaven over one sinner who does penance, more than over ninety-nine just ones who have there no penance needful" (Luke 15, 7): here is yet without circumlocution given the preference to the – after our human concepts – sinning before the virtuous! And of such parables gives it several. Also the parable of the lost son belongs hereto: we hear it gladly because it is so beautiful, nevertheless contradicts it just so much our religious as our worldly ideas and habits. Exactly the same as at the sin observe we at its counterpart, the good work: the alleged merit is accustomed the Saviour; just so as the sin, to estimate as secondary. For this witnesses for example the parable of the lord of the vineyard who in the evening pays out to all his workers the same wage, equal whether they had been active from early morning on and "have borne the load and heat of the day," or whether they had taken part only a unique last hour at the work. The murmuring day-labourer he dismisses: "Take that thine and go. I will however to this one who is the last give so much as to thee also; may I not do with the Mine what I will? or seest thou askance thereto that I am good?" (Matt. 20, 1–16). One heed that the Saviour designates this narration expressly as "a parable of the kingdom of God." Not otherwise stands it about the parable of the servant who tired and hungry returns home from the field and must first prepare the meal to his lord and wait upon him before he himself may rest and eat. "Does this servant about earn a merit that he has done what was commanded to him? So also you; when you have done all that is commanded to you, so say: we are servants, we have done what we were indebted to do" (Luke 17, 7–10, after the oldest text). So determined and sharp rejects Jesus – not true the good works from himself, well however the idea that they make out "a merit" and ground a claim: hereby falls however a further part of our ecclesiastical religion-teaching.

Can I also at these executions, as everywhere, only pointing proceed, I hope yet every reader begins to grasp which metaphysical depth distinguishes the religion-teaching of the Saviour before the teachings of the churches. Well is – as earlier discussed – this teaching of the Saviour presented with inimitable simplicity and gains thereby power over simple hearts; also belongs to it in another, deeper relation simplicity without equal: to the teaching one is a world of unfathomable thought-depth so familiar, he feels himself in it so at home, that he finds himself not first caused to approach a thought-wise (metaphysical) presentation and in perfected simplicity presents things that the wisest man is scarcely able to grasp. Foolish however is it over the simplicity to overlook the depth; whereto this leads know we: to the assertion Jesus has left behind at all no teaching (p. 102 ff.). By no means will I give to understand, in order to receive the blessing that radiates out of the Saviour's teaching, it is indispensable to descend into the deepest depths of the human thinking-capacity; under us of today is however the pure simplicity a rare gift, and who possesses it not must already decide himself to strike the other way – the way of the reflection –, otherwise remains to him no access to the message of Jesus; besides will one discover that precisely the all-deepest thinking leads back to the simplicity. Hardly can one gain insight into the metaphysical depth of the teaching of the kingdom of God – as Jesus presents it in his parables – and into the whole therewith hanging together world-view and life-conception who has not enjoyed instruction with the greatest thinkers of the East – Badarayana and Sankara – as well as with the greatest thinkers of the West – Plato and Kant; scarcely a man under many millions is capable out of own force and own drive to arrive to such knowledges, – rather can we not dispense with the leading of these rarest thinkers who have pre-thought to us all. Especially the Indian wise ones possess for us in this case special value because their whole thinking serves exclusively a religious interest; may they still so deep immerse themselves into the laws of the human thinking and experiencing and dissect them still so unheard fine-sensible, their unique motive to this effort-administration and their never out of the eye lost goal is and remains the "redemption" – the redemption out of a world of the appearance, of the error and of the sin; this redemption is however – exactly as with Jesus – thought as reached through an inner turn (rebirth) thanks to which the man suddenly perceives the presence of God and thereby enters into his kingdom: the expression "kingdom of God" may with these wise ones not occur, the concept covers itself however in the essential with that which the Saviour attaches to this word. And so find we then also there the teaching that at the entry into the kingdom of God the committed sins just so as the merits detach themselves and dissolve. Who beholds that Highest and Deepest, To him splits itself the heart's knot, To him solve themselves all doubts, And his works become nothing. In particular holds this of the sin. "As upon the leaf of the lotus-blossom the water does not stick, so sticks no evil deed to him who knows such" and: "As the panicle of the reed, stuck into the fire, burns, so burn all sins (of the knowing)." This teaching is the more noteworthy as at the same place the continuance of punishment and reward, of penance-performance and debt-annihilation is expressly emphasised, only hold these things uniquely within the sense- and understanding-world, against which the "God-knower" has already entered into the other world in which the meaning of our life – now more as lying outside the space and the time recognised – is beheld under a new eye-point: "Also of the good work holds just so as of the evil that it with the (God-)knower is annihilated and sticks not to him; why? because also the good work conditions a to it corresponding retribution and thus would hinder the fruit of the knowledge (of God); therefore the Scripture in words as 'he overcomes both' teaches the annihilation of the good work just so well as that of the evil (with the God-knower)" (Sankara, The Sutras of the Vedanta, 4, 1, 13 and 14). What our Saviour from divine height out with a unique glance grasps and therefore with perfected simplicity speaks, thither – to this knowledge – see we here honest about the truth wrestling men in incessant thought-work toilsome climb up.

The way that they struck could never lead to a full success; their work failed at the enormity of the claims placed to the thinking force of the men; God and the kingdom of God must in the person of the mediator step before our eyes, should they become accessible to every man-mind; nevertheless will we guard ourselves to leave such a high-point of holy-earnest human striving after God and his kingdom unheeded aside lying: the deep sense of Indian God-research is suited to open our eyes for the divine simplicity of the teachings of Jesus at which we blinded ones heedless pass by in that we before pure light mean to behold nothing. The thinkers of the West stood not in the service of the religion but in that of the science; therefore find we with them no so immediate relations to our object. Nevertheless will for many under us Kant's Critique of Pure Reason form the right preparation to the understanding of Jesus' sermon; for Kant alone leads into the world of the timeless present in which the Saviour's thinking lives. To the reader can I not spare the effort to rise up to the source; would I undertake myself to instruct him, the attempt must necessarily fail: such knowledge's let themselves not for lazy spirits mouth-ready shape, they must be worked out. One heed in Kant's main-work above all the great section: Of the Empirical Use of the Regulative Principle of the Reason in Regard to All Cosmological Ideas. Here learns one exactly to see in the difference between the world of the senses and of the necessity on the one side and on the other side the world of the freedom: in the world of the freedom was Jesus at home, out of it out is all that he teaches about God and God-kingdom to think spoken. If also Kant in that work otherwise does not draw the moral questions into consideration, he finds himself yet caused in a note to make us attentive upon following fact: "The actual morality of the actions (merit and debt) remains to us therefore, even that of our own behaviour, wholly hidden. Our imputations can only be referred upon the empirical character. How much however thereof pure effect of the freedom, how much of the mere nature and the un-indebted error of the temperament, or of its happy quality (merito fortunae) is to ascribe, can nobody fathom, and therefore also not after complete justice judge" (1st ed., p. 551). Uniquely out of this consideration out lets itself the behaviour of the Saviour opposite the sinners and the sins understand. To every one will at once fall in the word: "Judge not, so that you be not judged" (Matt. 7, 1) – a word with which no church knows something to begin, since it throws our common conception of the "sin" – as of a given and easy to judge fact – over the heap. The complete agreement with Kant clarifies still clearer out of the in the John-Gospel reported saying: "You judge after the flesh, I judge nobody" (8, 15, vos secundum carnem judicatis: ego non judico quemquam). After the flesh is a turn which as easy graspable expression exactly corresponds to the by Kant philosophically firm-determined concept of the "empirical character"; the explanation, I judge nobody (so sounds the genuine Luther-text), springs out of the same conviction as Kant's: "the actual morality of the actions remains wholly hidden." In the same connection make I attentive upon a further word of Kant's: "for a holy will hold no commandments" (Foundation to Metaphysic of Morals, 2nd section). This teaching corresponds literally to the Indian after which the concepts good and evil find no application upon a holy man; I mean however, first in this light becomes much with the Saviour understandable, so for example when, in face of the death, an inner turn transforms the criminal at the cross, and Jesus in the same moment sees all misdeeds fall off from him as if they had never been; or when the adulteress, under the impression of the eye and of the voice of Jesus, likewise experiences such a new-birth that the Saviour, without a word of blame, can dismiss her: go thither and sin from now on not more. With these pointings about the conception of the sin hope I to have opened the eyes to many a reader about the pure religion-teaching of the Saviour in distinction from – almost could one say in opposition to – all "Christian" church-teachings. Once become attentive, will every one always deeper grow into this new world of the Father and of his kingdom, or rather this new world will as the tree of the parable (p. 99) grow up around him into the height and surround him: without that he right knows how it has gone to, will he find himself sheltered in the kingdom of God and rescued out of man-fears. This religion of Jesus is the simplest that was ever proclaimed, at the same time the most tolerant: it requires at all no outer apparatus, since it turns itself merely to the inner man, nor shakes it at existing customs.

So have we for example seen in which immediate opposition the Saviour's teaching stands to the Judaism, and we know the bitter words in which the loving one frequently remembers the priests and scripture-scholars of that people; nevertheless remained he himself within this community in whose midst he had grown up, and gave his disciples an example – if not of the following of the laws that he, as we know, where it seemed good to him, broke through – yet of the true holding-fast to the old-inherited religion-customs. Just so noteworthy is it that we never hear him direct to the heathens with whom he manifoldly comes into touch a blaming or despising word about their religion, rather experience it often that he precisely praises heathens because of the force of their faith – "the like of which he has not found in Israel." Lays the Saviour little weight upon the religion-belonging of the men, so demands he just so little of them any restrictions in regard to their state and professional obligations: all these things are indifferent, since Jesus asks merely after a transformation of the disposition. The word: "So give to the emperor what is of the emperor" (Matt. 22, 21) belongs to the most known, yet over-think themselves perhaps few what therewith is spoken. The Jews contested with passion the claims of the Roman empire; especially the Galileans found themselves then almost constantly in uproar; to recognise the lawfulness of the imperial government meant to deny the own theocracy and to give up the claims of the Jews upon world-rule: this all does Jesus with that answer that he calmly and determined grants to the asking ones. Gives the Saviour himself content with every political world-order, so holds to him also no life-situation as hindrance for the to strive inner transformation. Very striking is that Jesus preaches no world-renunciation of any kind, what otherwise was the case with every religious renewer, and so especially also with his own contemporary, John the Baptist. The opposition to this one highlights he even once expressly in that he says John has renounced upon bread and wine (practised strictest abstinence), against which he, Jesus, lives so free that it of him says: "See, a glutton and winedrinker, the friend of tax-collectors and sinners" (Matt. 11, 19, Luke 7, 34). In this connection make I attentive that the Gospel Luke ascribes two words to John the Baptist that cannot belong to him and were certainly spoken by the Saviour. The one is directed to the tax-collectors – a companionship that because of their unclean business-conduct fell to general contempt (see for nearer Schürer) and answers the question what they shall do so that they be not found unworthy of the kingdom of God: "Take not more than whereto you are instructed" – thus be honest!

No syllable more. The second word answers the same question, posed by soldiers: "Disturb nobody, extort from nobody and let yourselves suffice at your pay" (3, 12 ff.). Consider one now the fundamental rejection of the military profession from the side of the Jews as well as the early-Christian shyness before blood-shedding that in our days led to the overstrainednesses of a Tolstoy, so grasps one the meaning of such a word and its tight relation to the Saviour's religion-teaching. Similar stands it in regard to his judgment of the soul-dangers that the possession of earthly goods brings with itself. Well speaks he the word: "It is easier that a camel go through a needle-eye than that a rich one enter into the kingdom of God" (Mark 10, 25); he adds however at once: "With men is it impossible, but not with God; for all is possible with God," and in the preceding verse where we now read: "How hard will the rich enter into the kingdom of God!" one read in an earlier text: "How hard will those who trust upon their possessions enter into the kingdom of God" – whereby again all emphasis is laid back upon the inner disposition: not thereupon comes it whether one is rich, but upon his conception of the meaning of his richness. This goes also out of another place where the Saviour allegedly would have spoken of the "deceit of the richness which stifles the word" – so read we until now (Matt. 13, 22), and served the word to ascetic preachers as text. Now have however newer researches and discoveries first now procured us an exact knowledge of the then folk-Greek, the language in which the writings of the New Testament are composed, and there turns it out that the word apate in the Hellenistic time meant no more as earlier "deceit," but pleasure, enjoyment; consequently has the Saviour not asserted that the goods of this world are in all cases a deceit and stifle the word, rather happens this when the richness serves merely to the enjoyment instead of being administered as an entrusted, by God to noble purposes gifted good (compare Milligan, N. T. Documents, p. 75).

We know besides that Jesus not only accepted invitations from rich houses, but that he was near befriended with well-to-do families and granted them to help him and his disciples "out of their property" (Luke 8, 3). First when we make present to ourselves all these things and without every ecclesiastical prepossession thoroughly over-think what they have to mean, goes to us the understanding for words as: "My yoke is soft and the load that I give to bear is light" (Matt. 11, 30). One over-think oneself which unbearable "load" the post-exilic law had imposed upon the unhappy Jewish people; no wonder when Nehemiah must report: "Then wept all the people when they heard the words of the law" (Chapter 8–10). Not small is however also the "load" which the Christian churches impose upon the consciences: there gives it outer commandments in fullness and fullness, customs that shall be indispensable to the soulweal; far worse however esteem I the soul-pain of the faith-force upon hundred ungraspable things, at threat of eternal punishments … Of all that find we with Jesus no trace: he demands simply that every one feel the presence of the Father and "become merciful as the Father is merciful"; upon this way "become we sons of the Highest who also against the evil and the unthankful is friendly mild" (Luke 6, 35 with drawing-to of the oldest text). To the reader will itself well of itself gradually the conviction have forced that this teaching of the divine Father and of the kingdom of God stands outside of all that we men otherwise are accustomed to present to ourselves as "religion" and as "church"; he has however at the same time learned to see in that it is by no means a matter of a mere morals-teaching; rather is one fired up to a highest heightening of living faith-force, and first when this has led the man into the immediate presence of the Father, follows out of that a deep-reaching transformation that is to compare with a new-birth.

How new the message also is that the Saviour brings to the men, and how hard it therefore also falls to attach it to any to us more familiar appearances of the mind-life, it helps yet very to a fuller understanding when one becomes attentive that men out of the Aryan kinship have at various times and at various places, under straining of all spirit-forces, striven that which Jesus taught and lived in the perfection. In order to convince oneself thereof, will the reader look up the place in the first chapter about the wholly pure God-concept as the Aryan Indians and the Aryan Germans have grasped it, about the God whom Master Eckhart names "a remaining thought in the soul" (p. 28). Exalted over all these groping attempts of noble longing-full ones stands Jesus of Nazareth – he who not seeks but "speaks what he knows" (John 3, 11); yet feels one himself there as here surrounded by the same air and experiences whereto one has to turn if one will approach the Saviour upon human ways. Also those men strive with their God-seeking something other than what their religions offer them, and praise themselves happy when they reach mystical depths in which all forms and formulas fall off from their burdened conscience and they feel the presence of the highest good being, of the Father. These poor ones root however so unentangleable firm in complicated religion-ideas that they only extremely toilsome wind themselves out without ever to be able to reach the full unboundness, – always stood and stands still today a last separating wall between these men and their goal; against which the Saviour in perfected freedom from above down floats and out of this perfected mastership the simplicity and simplicity of his unfathomably deep teaching results itself of itself. He carpenters no structure of faitharticles, founds no church, teaches no customs and devotion-exercises through which a God shall be made favourable minded, he sees merely upon an actual movement in the soul-life of the man, upon an actual upward-striving of his will to the Higher (p. 27 ff.) that the man divines and knows over himself, upon a decided grasping of the God-hand; therefore asks he not out of which region of human delusion-thoughts the single one may come, nor condemns he the various learned religion-customs: what to us – in space and time captive – seems decisive is for him without meaning; he pursues a unique goal: to introduce us into the presence of the Father – and that means into the kingdom of God. Hereto stands out of every direction the way open; and here arrived, falls all other off because the man through this deed as a transformed one has entered into the timelessness: this deed, this event names the Saviour faith, and of it hold the sayings: "Fear thee not, believe only!" (Mark 5, 36) and: "If thou believest, can all become to thee" (Mark 9, 23 after the oldest text). Afterword I break here off; for it is a matter

of things that can merely be pointed and at which – as I have convinced myself through the attempt – thoroughness, in that it heaps words and pictures, weakens and unclarifies the impression of the unspeakable: if the said suffices to lead some to Jesus himself, so have my executions fulfilled their purpose. A few words shall strike a bridge from this consideration about the Saviour and his teaching to the three following chapters about that which the men made out of this appearance and this teaching, and out of which the ecclesiastical religion arose that we name Christianity. In order to take it shortly beforehand: the teaching of Jesus vanished because ununderstood; yet its proclaimer remained, and thereby remained the living source of divine blessing preserved to the mankind. The Father of whose immediate nearness Jesus had wanted to convince us throned now more in world-distances, and the God-kingdom after which we merely needed to bow ourselves in order topossess it, the kingdom that already in this life as a tree shielded us in whose branches merry little birds sang, should open itself to us first long after the death and after the most frightful judgment that threatened eternal punishments; also Jesus himself moved us – as Christ – always farther: first was he named "the image of the invisible God" (an in and for itself right dark expression), – scarcely stand these words however upon the paper as they no more suffice to the writer, and Jesus Christ becomes himself the world-creator, "all is created through him and upon him, and he is before all, and all consists in him" (Col. 1, 15 ff.); yet beside Christ the God remained – thanks to the Gospels – Jesus the Son of Man; he was the mediator, and henceforth believed the men in God "through Jesus Christ." In this word – as already earlier remarked (p. 79) – lies the whole blessing of the Christian churches enclosed: the inner power of this appearance conquers over every distortion, over every human delusion-thought, over all primordial-priestly ideas out of the childhood of the mankind that we as ballast further-drag – and always anew stands this appearance there, shining in its simplicity and rest, – untouchable. To it flees out of the various confessions who only is capable to receive religious blessing – and he receives it, equal what he otherwise still all at superstitious by-work may have burdened upon his poor striving soul. Within the earliest, still becoming Christianity led the mediator-ship of Jesus to interpretations whose difference is today overlooked by the most: so for example attached the three first evangelists to generally in the people spread ideas, especially to that of an to expect God-sent hero who should anew erect the kingdom of David – of the "Messiah" (in Greek: Christ), against which Paul – through the rabbis introduced into the art of the scripture-interpretation and at the same time since early youth surrounded by Hellenistic religion-ideas – undertook to re-poetise the whole Old Testament to a new world-myth in which Jesus from beginning to end forms the middle shape, whereby the concept of the Messiah is wholly transformed. John on his side attached himself to the Hellenistic Gnosticism in order to be able to combat it the more effectively, and grasped Jesus as the embodied Logos. Since these three conceptions remained existing beside one another – thereto as a fourth the by the Gospels preserved shape and teaching of the genuine Jesus, so arose in the church-teaching an unsolvable confusion; yet one was common to all: the mediator-ship of Jesus Christ between man and God, and this remained and remains the religious hinge-point of every true Christianity.

III. The Saviour

The revelation of the mystery which was kept secret through ages, but is now made manifest.

(Paul the Apostle)

Every century brings forth its own madness, born of the false directions into which its thinking falls with historical necessity; to later ages such delusions reveal themselves at once as errors, indeed they stare one in the face, yet so long as their dominion lasts even the cleverest men—for the most part—are as if struck with blindness. Among the numerous follies of this kind belonging to the nineteenth century, none will certainly appear more grievous to future generations than the doctrine which has repeatedly appeared in various forms and been received with applause, that Jesus of Nazareth was a mythical figure, that is, one invented by men, no real personality who once walked the earth in flesh and blood. According to some there never existed a man of this name at all (thus, for example, according to J. M. Robertson: Christianity and Mythology, 1900); others—scholars more seriously to be taken—did not deny the existence of Jesus, yet held him to be a more or less obscure Galilean religious enthusiast and popular agitator of the sort of which history knows a number, but declared the evangelical reports to be essentially free inventions, the words ascribed to Jesus to be unauthentic, in short the figure familiar to European mankind for nearly two thousand years to be an invented phantasy-image—invented namely by Paul, the pupil of the rabbis, and a small group of fanatics, which soon expanded as the religious madness spread and brought in new mythical material from all sides, so that in a short time a complete doctrinal edifice stood there, carpentered out of nothing but airy structures. These attempts to rob the personality of the Saviour of all independent life reach from David Friedrich Strauss in the year 1835 to Arthur Drews in the year 1909. It is not my intention to enter into this literature; whoever wishes to occupy himself with it is referred to the excellent work of Albert Schweitzer, History of the Life-of-Jesus Research. For my part I regret every hour which I—driven by pedantic conscientiousness—devoted to it. Even a Strauss—whose knowledge and ability deserve high respect—could do no otherwise: once set upon the fundamentally false track, he had to entangle himself ever deeper in the thicket of inconsistencies, of impossibilities, and finally of absurdities; his successors and over imbibers, however—not equal to him in specialised knowledge—have brought it to such a degree of nonsense that one must ask oneself whether they are making fools of their readers or whether their own power of judgment has really suffered complete shipwreck.

In the meantime the whole of true science—and that in all its shades, from the strictest orthodoxy to freethinking and even to the declared opponents of Christian religious ideas—went the exactly opposite way, cleared away one historical doubt after another, discovered many documents and inscriptions which all pointed in the same direction and at the same time brought new confirmation with new enlightenment; today—one may assert this without exaggeration as an established fact—the first Christian centuries are more exactly known than many nearer to us, and that—despite all still gaping gaps—down to details concerning which earlier research would never have dared to hope to gain knowledge. It requires unabashed boldness and naïve limitation still in the twentieth century to assert that Christ's life represents the course of the sun through the zodiac, and that the Apostle Peter is nothing other than the Proteus known from Hellenic mythology, who at Poseidon's command "feeds the lambs"! Such nonsense, however, finds the effective support of our Jewish world-press, which with sure instinct seizes upon everything that appears suitable to it for harming the hated Christianity; in consequence the layman—unless he possesses special connections—learns next to nothing of the true results of science.

A further consideration, however, deserves no less attention than the preceding one.

Were the sources still more badly buried than they are, and were thereby the many results upon which scientific research today can point with joyful pride denied it, the historicity of Jesus Christ and of the circle of his first disciples and adherents, as well as the reliability in all essential features of the reports concerning his life, his teaching and his death, would nevertheless stand unshakably firm for every soundly judging man. Revolutionary religious movements have always —so all history teaches—proceeded from mighty, solitary personalities: far-reaching effects upon the souls of many men only an over-great soul is able to win, a soul such as appears scarcely once in the course of millennia. It is true that under the pressure of world-historical events and conditions special mental moods arise which, like diseases, spread by transmission and can rise to mass-madness: in this connection one would also have to refer to the longing for that frame of mind which we call faith and which we came to know in the preceding chapter. In the time around Christ's birth this longing seized the various peoples of the Roman Empire: old religions suddenly awoke to new life, even Judaism, otherwise rejecting every stranger, temporarily admitted conversion and gained—especially among the women—numerous proselytes; new cults sprang from the fertile imagination of the Asiatic mixed peoples; the state itself granted protection and support. All these attempts to administer the longed-for refreshment to the mind found adherents and confessors, and all the more so as no religion fought the others: whoever had today performed his devotion in the house of Mithras joined tomorrow the splendid procession of the Isis priests; thus everyone hunted after salvation. Such a fermentation in the soul-life of the peoples naturally has a significance and leads especially easily to catastrophes; yet in and for itself it possesses not the least formative power; modern psychology and medicine have demonstrated these phenomena as effects of so-called suggestion, whose essence consists in a weakening of the power of judgment and a paralysis of the individual will in favour of blind herdinstincts, consequently stands as far as possible from creative power and free joy in shaping. Therefore the thought appears inadmissible from the outset that out of the community of hundreds of thousands of ordinary and moreover psychically weakened and erring men—as those of that time unquestionably were—a new world-view overturning all previously existing ones could proceed—a completely and utterly new conception of the dignity of man, based upon a completely and utterly new idea of his relation to God. Were—say in consequence of a mighty earthquake—all written testimonies which report of the founding and the first period of development destroyed,—the mere fact of the existence of the Christian doctrine of faith and frame of mind would with irresistible necessity point to a founder. Now we are, however, as already remarked, moreover in a position to follow the first steps of Christianity entering into life with astonishing exactness; everyone should strive after this knowledge— for which as best introduction Adolf Harnack's Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries may serve: whoever, instead of taking Christianity in dull self-evidence as a given fact, informs himself about these beginnings, will see the greatest miracle of world-history unroll before his eyes. The miracles which the evangelists ascribe to Jesus Christ do not all reach this miracle of the expansion of Christianity. It is the victory of the spirit over matter, the victory of pure power of faith over the strongest ruling power that has ever reigned on earth. On the one side a handful of men without reputation, without means, without influence, on the other side the Imperium Romanum, in brazen invincibility hurling its veto against them. The old state religions and the various mystery religions, which all lived with one another on the best footing of mutual toleration, are from the beginning united in the hate-filled rejection of Christianity, which on its side likewise denied them the right to existence, so that a struggle of life and death was provoked by Christianity itself. In the lead the already then influential Judaism hunts and causes the first cruel persecutions; these repeat themselves ever anew, and even the philosopher on the imperial throne, otherwise preacher of all-round tolerance, attempts to exterminate the hated Christians by fire, sword and wild beasts. No political counter-action of any kind stands at the disposal of the Christians scattered over the world; every defence by force of arms is excluded; they can only endure and die: how they do that we have seen in the preceding chapter in the example of Ignatius of Antioch.

Worldly considered the continuance of Christianity beyond the first two centuries—let alone its victory—is not to be explained at all; it is a matter, as already said, of a victory of purely spiritual forces over everything that otherwise determines man from need, instinct and passion. One knows the word of Cecil Rhodes, worthy to be nailed for all time as the confession of the Antichrist: “Every man has his price; only the price is different”; here now many thousands of men, women and also children were ready to sacrifice every moment everything that life offered and promised them and to step without hesitation into the most agonising death; what their spirit held fast counted for them as the highest good: a transformation, a rebirth must have taken place in them. And what had effected it? Whence came this new force unknown to the world of that time? Into their souls the faith had entered. And what faith? The faith in God through Jesus Christ. The old feeling of the presence of a “highest good being,” of a “Father in heaven” (see p. 24), had gradually been lost with the increasing complication of civilisation and rising refinement of culture; Jesus brought the tidings of this God again, and that on a higher stage of conscious grasping, whereby man and God drew immediately near to one another. This suddenly blossoming faith lived, however, at first only in the heart of the one Incomparable; only from this heart did it radiate into the other hearts: the way to God led through Jesus; no other way led thither.

We have seen the men how full of longing they stretched out their arms after a mediator and sought to bring this forth out of their fantasy: they never reached the goal, fantasy-image remained fantasyimage, they never attained to faith. Now, however, the mediator had appeared! Before his mere countenance all good men remained shaken with astonishment; his eye penetrated into the last depths of their souls, there awakening or bestowing forces—who could decide that?—of which they had hitherto suspected nothing; and when then his mouth opened to words such as had never been heard, they believed they heard God himself speaking. A “Rise up and follow me!” sufficed—and the world with its cares and hopes, with its sufferings and joys was forgotten. These disciples were rich neither in means nor in spirit; they also did not take up their experience with conscious, distinguishing thought; upon some reflection, however, we understand quite well that precisely such men were the most suitable to mirror purely an unheard-of new thing; though they at the same time mirror the conceptions of their time—this happens, however, with such perfect simplicity that the disentanglement makes little difficulty: it is mad to ascribe to precisely these first bearers of Christianity any arbitrary mythical and other religion-forming additions; for that they were as incapable as unwilling. A single exception—both in regard to education and to talent—is offered by the Apostle Paul; yet precisely him we are in a position to follow exactly at work: certainly he is subject to more manifold influences than his Galilean comrades—we shall have to speak of that later—, yet the more exactly his teaching is investigated, the more powerfully the influence of the words and directions of Jesus exactly known to him proves itself (see especially the thorough investigations of Paul Feine, Paul Kölbing and Gardner); with him also therefore the influences of the time are not difficult to separate. In short, we have to do with well-attested historical processes: that only the ill-willed or the cross grained or the ignorant can still deny today: science and the power of judgment have spoken their united word.

Hereby it is now not asserted that we possess in the Gospels a historical work in the sense which we today attach to this word: against such a misunderstanding it is hardly necessary to raise objection. Important on the contrary is the consideration whether it would have been possible for any, even the most gifted scientifically trained historical investigator to create a book which in richness of content and in world-encompassing power of effect would have approached even remotely the book which we possess? The question can be answered with all decisiveness in the negative. It is difficult for me, indeed it will not succeed for me, to find the words for an insight which is very necessary for us of today; perhaps a hint suffices so that the reader may grasp what it aims at.

However imperfect, gappy, nebulous, ungraspable the tidings are which we possess concerning the Saviour, I am convinced that it would have been impossible for a divine providence to find a more suitable vessel for the communication that was here concerned. Every approximation to protocol-like exactness would have distorted the real truth just as much and robbed it of its pulsating content as a photograph does to nature in comparison. Here space, air, resonance are what matter; every intentionality, every human wishing to-be-wise would have extinguished everything: that holds of the words as of the deeds. We hear the voice of Jesus only thanks to the circumstance that the disciples indeed received his words into pious hearts, yet never completely understood them; and had they not seen him work miracles, they would have been incapable of letting us feel his miracle-working nature. In the last resort it comes to an impulse to one's own deed: that Jesus was a historical person forms only a part of the evangelical message; what it above all wills is to convince us of his presence: we are to open the eyes and behold him himself, we are to hear his voice in our own ear. Origen speaks a wonderful word: "O that the Lord Jesus would also lay his hands upon our eyes, so that we also might begin not to look upon that which is visible, but upon the invisible, and that he might unveil for us … the glance of the heart with which God is beheld in the spirit through him, the Lord Jesus Christ" (after Harnack). Hereby is exactly designated what the evangelical reports are to perform—and also perform as soon as their word falls upon receptive soil: to unveil the glance of the heart!

We shall return to the Gospels still in the sequel; for the moment it suffices me if I—without denying the gaps, the obscurities and the contradictions—have awakened the thought that in this one, incomparable case veiling leads to unveiling. One of the characteristic faults of our time, not alone in the religious but also in the natural-scientific field, is the not-knowing of what one can and should ask; we pose every question, only not this one; were we to do it, many discords and silly prejudices would vanish at a stroke from the intellectual life of our public. Of God—that we saw in the first chapter—the human understanding is scarcely able to say anything further than that he is and must be, because we men would otherwise not be men; for the rest the understanding, when left to itself, can scarcely get beyond the "neti, neti!" Suppose therefore the case that the divine wished to mingle itself as appearance among men, is it even thinkable that we men with our so limited understanding would be capable of representing to ourselves in what way this becoming-flesh (incarnation) would take place? That is excluded: every statement ventured hereupon can only be an image, at best a myth. Thus for example the many disputes about the virgin birth are, properly considered, objectless. The narrative is in and for itself beautiful and significant; no weight is to be laid upon the asserted impossibility—nature after all teaches us every day that that which we held for impossible happens; only no man can think anything thereby, because virgin and mother are contradictory concepts: and a perfect contradiction remains equally mysterious for the wise as for fools.

There is also no reason inventible why at the birth of a divine being the male stem should be switched off —unless Hellenic conceptions of kinship of the gods still hovered before the mind. The Gospels notoriously leave this question open by contradicting one another; it is quite certain that neither Paul nor John knew anything of the birth of Christ from a virgin; John simply names the Saviour son of Joseph (1, 45), and Paul never mentions his mother nor the nearer circumstances of his birth at all— now consider what weight precisely this man would have laid upon such a fact! He who must be called the creator of the Christian myth: his silence proves that the narrative familiar to us in twofold form, from Matthew and Luke, was either unknown to him or seemed unauthentic; for he says expressly of the Saviour, "who was come of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1, 3). And the Apostle John says in general of all those men who are suited to become "children of God": "They are not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God begotten" (John 1, 12 ff.).

How much wiser were the earliest Christians than their successors! The same holy martyr Ignatius, whom we have already repeatedly met, writes in his letter to the Ephesians: “For our God, Jesus the Christ, was according to God’s counsel of salvation conceived in the body of Mary, indeed of the seed of David, yet at the same time of the Holy Spirit” (18, 2)—whereby the words “seed of David” unquestionably point to the fatherhood of Joseph, since Mary according to oldest tradition belonged to the tribe of Levi. To this pupil of the apostles therefore the conception that Christ as man was son of Joseph and at the same time as God the Son of God made no difficulty, nor did he find anything degrading therein.

To make compulsory articles of faith (dogmas) out of such things, to which everyone is obliged to believe, I hold for an offence against the human spirit and thereby also against the Holy Spirit of God. For of facts which our understanding is not able to grasp—as the appearance of a superhuman being upon earth is one—we can only approach gropingly; what is according to the one may appear unacceptable to the other; to each must the freedom be preserved to raise himself Godward upon the way corresponding to his nature; upon this whole field we must recognise the principle: different statements—even when they contradict one another—can be equal in content of truth. Jesus Christ has dwelt upon earth as mediator between God and man and has died for our redemption: that we can know; all further the Gospels leave in the semi-darkness—and that they do so testifies to divine mastery.

What is here said of the birth holds also of the death—only in reverse direction: in the one case our understanding cannot grasp what preceded, in the other not what followed. We can namely always and everywhere perceive Jesus with the senses and follow him with thought only where he gives himself as man; as soon as he is God he vanishes out of this field of vision, and however firmly the mind may hold to him by faith, every statement about him now receives another character. Concerning all events which immediately precede the death we are especially thoroughly and exactly informed; with the moment of death a mist as it were sinks before the eyes, the four evangelical reports no longer agree and are partly abrupt and ambiguous,—also show here and there visible traces of later reworking.

Concerning the resurrection an immeasurable amount has been written by the specialised scholars; for not alone does every commentary to every one of the Gospels and to the first letter of Paul to the Corinthians bring thorough expositions, as likewise every life of Jesus, but there is a whole book-shop of writings which devote themselves solely to the investigation of this one question—and that without ever reaching a result that would compel the assent of all. Upon that little or rather nothing at all depends: solely upon this it comes, that one gain the insight that here upon purely logical path no result is to be expected, because it is a matter of processes which indeed touch and as it were traverse the world of appearance, to the knowledge of which our understanding and the senses serving it are restricted, yet for the greater part play themselves out outside this boundary.

That the first Christians believed in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead needs no proof: Christianity arose namely as consequence of the resurrection, and for long years the greeting of those meeting one another ran: “Christ is risen!” One may think and interpret this “rising” as one will—past the fact itself no man capable of judgment can get. It is true that the Jews at once asserted that the disciples had stolen the body out of the grave in order then to be able to declare that their master had risen from the dead; yet the slightest reflection convinces that this clumsy invention sets up at once the impossible and the insufficient. The terrified disciples, robbed of all hope by the execution of their leader, had fled and kept themselves hidden; moreover the concept of a resurrection was foreign to them, for it did not belong to the conceptions then current in Judaism, and we know that they could not explain to themselves words of the Saviour which pointed to his resurrection after death: “And the disciples disputed among themselves what that might mean, to rise from the dead” (Mark 9, 10 and see e.g. John 2, 22): therefore neither the capacity to carry out the theft nor the thought of doing it is to be credited to them. Far more weight, however, falls against this assertion two other considerations.

First, with these simple Galileans, among whom at that time not a single man of outstanding energy and initiative was to be found, such a Machiavellian plan appears absolutely excluded, just as the spiritual force to found a new religion upon this path. Secondly, however, it is downright brainless to presuppose that a lie concerted between two or three obscure men would have sufficed to call forth the irresistible movement which at once seized hundreds and thousands of human hearts, filled them with heavenly hoping and steeled them to unshakable faith in God. Rightly Origen replies to the denier Celsus that the behaviour of the disciples, their suddenly brightly blazing faith, the power of action awakened in them defying all obstacles and the power of conviction which they won over thousands, these undeniable historical facts are in and for themselves the most conclusive and irrefutable proof that they had seen with eyes the Jesus risen from the dead, for out of this overwhelming experience they had first drawn the force for all further (Book 1, Chap. 31). This judgment holds today just as in the year two hundred when it was pronounced; yes, I assert: the existence of Christianity proves the fact of the resurrection. As the Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians: "But if Christ be not raised, then is your faith vain. … If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15, 17, 19).

How the resurrection is to be thought, that is a quite other question. For my part I join myself to one of the most significant heads among the contemporary German theologians, the critically and thoroughly freely thinking Friedrich Loofs, and confess "that no one can stretch himself with his thinking beyond our previous experience: how that which the disciples experienced was possible—that I do not know. … I do not know it and I hold not-knowing here not for shyness of truth" (The Resurrection Reports and their Value, 3rd ed., p. 40 ff.). It would indeed be of interest to know how the men who beheld the Risen One interpreted their vision; yet from the reports nothing exact and especially nothing agreeing can be gathered: some describe circumstances which exclude a massive corporeality, others precisely emphasise this. Only concerning one man's judgment do we know exactly: the Apostle Paul writes in the same chapter in which he enumerates the appearances of the Risen One: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption" (1 Cor. 15, 50), and still more of the like, and in his letter to the Philippians he distinguishes between the earthly "body of our humiliation" and the "body of glory" of the risen Jesus (3, 21). It can therefore lie under no doubt that this most significant among the first Christians did not think of a resurrection of the dead body, but of a continued life in transfigured form outside the conditions of earthly existence familiar to us (1 Cor. 15, 44 ff.). This is decisively confirmed by a circumstance which many perhaps overlook: Paul enumerates all the appearances of the Risen One of which he knows, in order (in the same place, verse 5 ff.), yet mentions with not a syllable the empty grave nor the visit of the women connected therewith—the empty grave therefore possessed for him no significance, perhaps he held this narrative for a pious legend. In order to overlook the connection and thus also to be able to judge rightly, one must know and consider the following fact.

We heard above of the malicious tale of the Jews that Christ's disciples had secretly removed his body out of the grave. Many a reader will have asked himself what this desecration of the rest of the grave was to have aimed at? The Semites and with them the Jews—with the coarse materialism which distinguishes their religious life from that of other men—are incapable of representing to themselves a future life if the same body does not continue to serve this new life also as bearer. I can cite for this the work of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Plato, which appeared a few days ago (1919, 1, 335): "Whoever for the Semitic way of thinking is not fallen to death, who therefore is thought as further working, must either together with his body be raised into immortality, or together with his body have risen from death"; while the Hellene already in Homer's times was familiar with the conception of an "immaterial bodilessness," "the Semite cannot get free of the corporeal."

In these conceptions the disciples of Christ together with their surroundings had grown up; that must not be overlooked: for only therefrom does one understand the accusation of the Jews, and at the same time this Jewish materialism works upon the conception of the disciples of their experiences, consequently also upon their representation. Paul, however, as religious genius, who moreover from early youth had stood under the influence of a Hellenistic environment, conceived, as we saw, the resurrection of Christ otherwise and needed for it no breaking open of the gate of the grave. Though Wilamowitz may be right with the fine remark that Paul remains materialist insofar as the "pneumatic body" taught by him, made of "heavenly stuff," is still always a body; yet I mean that he has thereby taken so significant a step upon the way to idealisation that one could fairly expect no more of him. Notoriously the Church has not followed him, rather remained imprisoned in the coarse sensuality of Semitic half-thoughts.

For the conclusion of this discussion let a glorious word of Luther's serve: "For we do not speak and confess this article (of the resurrection) in the prayer for the reason that it alone has happened, as we otherwise as we otherwise tell a fable, fairy-tale or story; but that it may become strong, true and living in the heart. And that we call faith, when we so imagine it to ourselves that we put ourselves wholly and entirely into it, just as if nothing else were written but: Christ is risen!" And one thing more. Should a friend wish to hear my own confession, I would say to him the following. Inasmuch as Jesus

—so far as he was man, the perfectus homo of the ecclesiastical confessions—died, he vanished out of the world of space and of time, and therewith also out of history; since the moment of his death I can "know" nothing more about him, only believe. Precisely because I had the good fortune to receive the training of exact science and was moreover taught by Immanuel Kant that "he had to abolish knowledge in order to make room for faith" (Critique of Pure Reason, Preface to the 2nd edition, p. XXX)—thanks to these two circumstances I am accustomed to distinguish sharply between knowledge and faith. What I believe stands anchored still deeper in my mind than that which I imagine I know; it stands, however, in another place, under other laws, and consequently it is difficult for me to find my way into the heads of the uninstructed and to grant them a glance into my own head, since most of them possess no clear idea of this distinction. I know that the sun stands in the heaven; firmer and more certain and richer in content, however, is my faith in Jesus Christ as my Saviour. What Christ has brought us is the faith in God: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also" (John 8, 19). The earliest Christians knew that well, and we read for example in the Epistle to Diognetus: "For who among all men, before Christ appeared, knew even in the least what God is?" The unperceivable, unthinkable God became visible in Christ and spoke as man words audible to us, whose super-earthly sound rings in our ears today just as it did in the ears of the men two thousand years ago. As the Apostle Paul says of the appearance of Christ: "It made it dawn in our hearts unto the radiant uprising of the knowledge and of the glory of God in the face of Christ" (2 Cor. 4, 6). Jesus the revelation of God upon earth: that is the content of the "glad tidings." That God does not die is clear; death can at most release him from the pressure of a temporarily assumed corporeality: Jesus lives from eternity to eternity. Therefore I designate without hesitation the word "resurrection" as an allegory; to stand, to arise, to rise again are concepts which presuppose a spatial world and a temporal determination; yet I explain to myself the use of this allegory quite well, already from the Jewish mode of thought described above, as also from the need of historical connection with the life just concluded. If the disciples were finally to grasp the meaning of this life, the meaning of their enormous experience, and thereby first be made fit for their world-historical office, then Jesus had to appear to them and speak to them: for this necessity we possess the historical proof; for only out of this event that admits of no comparison did Christianity arise—as we already saw. Concerning the manner, however, in which these appearances are to be interpreted intellectually, I confess my ignorance and confess that I hold every explanation from the outset for impossible and reject every dogmatic decision thereupon.

For this my view I appeal once more to Origen; he writes at one place in his De Principiis (Book 2, Chap. 6, Section 2), where he speaks of the incarnation, the death and the resurrection: "To turn to human ears with such things and to attempt to set them forth in words far exceeds the capacities of our understanding and of our language; yes, I am even of the opinion that it exceeded the capacities of the holy apostles; probably even the heavenly beings are incapable of grasping these mysteries by thought." Between the unsearchable entry into earthly existence and the exit from this existence, surrounded by secrets never to be interpreted, into another that is incomprehensible to our understanding, lies a short life which—up to the last eight days—as soon as one regards it from without, runs its course far from the world and eventless; of no founder of religion or reformer known to us does history report anything similar; rather we see men of this kind struggle through inner soul-torments up to mighty resolutions in order then to step forth and work revolutionarily upon the world surrounding them—let Buddha,

Mohammed and Luther only be recalled here. With Jesus there is neither talk of the passionate war in his own bosom nor of the overturning of existing institutions. Should one object that we know next to nothing about the first thirty years of this life and therefore can say nothing about the inner struggles, I would contradict that: for there exists an intimate connection between the inner soul-struggles of the renewers of religion and the character of their later violent energy of action: for the divine repose which must have filled Jesus' heart from the beginning, his silent endurance bears witness when the world at last became attentive to him and sought his death. We do not, indeed, wish to undervalue as unhistorical the significant allegory of the temptation in the wilderness; yet precisely this manner of withdrawing into solitude in the hour of temptation, of becoming master of the evil impulses with quiet resolve and then returning composedly into the accustomed surroundings, testifies to a heavenly harmony of the soul for which we possess no second example. Everyone of us must now above all feel the imperious urge to call up before his eyes as livingly as possible this heavenly harmony as it walked upon earth as personality—the "Son of Man," as it loved to designate itself; the whole of Christianity is rooted in the impression beyond comparison which this personality made upon a few hundred men and left behind with them as source of immeasurable force. The many for whom Jesus Christ means a mere name, yet not these alone, but also those who believe in him as Redeemer and worship him as God, do not suspect what they lack so long as they are without the said conception. The Gospels, however gappy their reports may be, conceal—and for him who does not know how to read them, hide—a fullness of facts suited to bring the Saviour near and ever nearer to us. Upon the question of the racial affiliation of the families of Joseph and of Mary I will not enter here, first because it is insoluble, second because we do well to revere the mystery of the birth of our Saviour. [Footnote: What might be said here I have attempted to summarise in the chapter "The Appearance of Christ" of my Foundations; in a historical work such a discussion was in place. I will only add that a learned specialist, Professor Haupt in Baltimore, has since expressed the conjecture that Mary and Joseph were by race Aryan Medes, which he bases especially upon the fact that the inhabitants of Galilee were for the greater part Medes. (This information I take from the work of the English theologian Mac Clymont: New Testament Criticism, its history and results, 1913, p. 150.)— Meanwhile the writing of Delitzsch, The Great Deception (1920), has appeared, in which we read on p. 94: "Jesus' parents and ancestors were as Galileans according to Old Testament as well as cuneiform testimony quite certainly not of Jewish blood, but belonged to the great number of Galilean Jewish proselytes. That Jesus was no prophet of Jewish blood is taught by his conception of God, diametrically opposed to the Jewish, and is confirmed by all his discourses together with his whole life and death."] It is enough for us to know that the Saviour was indeed brought up in the Israelite faith, yet did not live in surroundings that one could call "Jewish" in the narrower sense of the word. The inhabitants of Galilee (the "heathen district") formed an essentially different stamp of men from the Jews of Judaea, stood also politically under another government; they distinguished themselves by love of work, cheerful disposition, energetic sense of independence—which they heroically proved in their repeated uprisings. "A Galilean and a resolute man mean the same thing in Jewish usage," remarks Herder.

The Jews never recognised the Galileans as full Jews; to them, for example, public reading at divine service within Judaea was forbidden; their pronunciation was so neglected—so it was mocked—that with a certain word one did not know whether the Galilean was speaking of wine, of wool, of an ass or of a lamb (Lightfoot: Galatians, p. 197). Among these men now Jesus lived his life and among them found his adherents—the first mediators of the Christian faith. "It was good," writes Herder, "that Christ, far from Judaea and proud Jerusalem, although only for a short time, carried on his business in this province (Galilee); there they would not have granted him even this short time. Here he spoke with the common, a lively people, with men of sound understanding, at their occupations. Also his more intimate disciples he had chosen for himself from these regions...." (Of the Redeemer of Men, Section 3, Abs. 9). Everyone knows the passages of the Gospels in which Jesus and his adherents are mocked as "Galileans," and A. Merx sees in the speech of Caiaphas (John 11, 49–50) an indication that the high priest did not regard the Saviour "as a full Israelite" (The Four Canonical Gospels, final volume, p. 299). The fact of this Galilean environment is, however, as one sees, by no means done justice to by the usual conception of the Saviour as a Jew in the land of the Jews. Even apart from the principal figure, the manner of the reaction conditioned another life in Galilee than would have been the case in Judaea, and thereby determined the starting-point of Christianity. Let us further note that the Saviour grew up in the country (Nazareth was a village), in the midst of a healthy peasant people, in a richly blessed, laughingly beautiful region,—far therefore from all urban misery and—as said—outside the landscape of the desolate homeland of the proper Jews, Judaea. Enough for the present about the outer conditions under which the personality manifested itself; let us turn to the inner. Something that would equal an enumerating description of purely human traits is nowhere to be found in the Gospels; yet the attentive reader discovers numerous hints, sufficient to gain, if not a finished portrait, yet a definite impression—material for rich reflection. We find there expressions of joy, of pain, of compassion, of astonishment, of despair; great passionateness radiates from various sayings, e.g.: "I am come to cast fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled!" (Luke 12, 49); yes, early texts even report of upwellings of anger and wrath; thus Mark 8, 12 reads in the oldest of all known manuscripts (called by scholarship Syrsin): "And he was angry in the spirit," and in other old texts: "He was wroth in his spirit." Unfortunately most of these small purely human traits have been wiped away by later pious editors—not from the conscious intention of falsifying the text, but from the anxiety that all-too-human traits might diminish the reverence before the God; in the above case, for example, we read today: "He sighed in his spirit." In the scientific books one finds examples enough of this gradual toning-down of originally present colours. How much, however, he can still discover who approaches the texts not with cold scepticism but with loving desire for knowledge is best proved by the section in Burkitt concerning a certain bitter cheerfulness or "mournful irony" which often breaks through in the Saviour and was understood neither by his disciples nor by their successors, since this mood of mind remained wholly foreign to that of early Christianity, pointing as it does to a superior freedom of spirit: Burkitt has especially in mind the passage in Luke 22, 35 ff., where the Saviour on the evening of the arrest recommends to his disciples the purchase of swords, as if he intended to rely upon force of arms (Gospel Transmission, Chap. 4). Even about daily habits we learn something: thus for example the love of solitude (Mark 1, 45), the rising at daybreak in order to slip quietly out of the midst of the sleeping disciples for an unguided early walk over the fields (Mark 1, 35) or up onto a height (Mark 3, 13), so that the astonished and evidently offended adherents have difficulty in finding their Master; another time, in order to escape the touches of the crowd, Jesus quickly springs into a boat and has it put off from the shore (Mark 3, 9). Deeper than these observations the immersion in his speech leads us into the essence of the Saviour: upon this path we advance step by step ever more into the interior.

Speaking in parables is indeed customary in the Orient; yet with Jesus it is not a matter of the parables alone—however unexampled and inimitable these also flowed from his mouth—rather he speaks, even outside the proper parables, almost always in images, and these images are taken from the observation of nature and of human work in the country.

Already two and a half centuries ago a man whose capacity for "objective" judgment even the doubter will not deny, Sir Isaac Newton, in his commentary on the Book of Daniel, pointed to this distinctive peculiarity of the Saviour's speech, who, instead of— like the Orientals—drawing dramatic-effective and often even bombastic comparisons, always with perfect simplicity links on to that which lies before the eyes of himself and his companions: from everything he knows how to extract significance—even from the sparrow on the roof and the anemone in the field. And what Newton, the astronomer and physicist, had observed with his sharp eye, our contemporary F. Crawford Burkitt—admittedly the most significant among the living theologians of England—has confirmed on the ground of his specialised knowledge: the whole of literature can exhibit nothing that in regard to thought- and expression-style possesses even the remotest similarity with the parables of Jesus (The Gospel History and its Transmission, Chap. 6). In the first place the perfection in the imagery of the manner of speaking effects that the single word loses significance in a certain sense,—inasmuch namely as the thoughts lie wholly and entirely in the images—not properly in the words which convey the images: from this there follows now a circumstance which has possessed decisive significance for the preservation and further working of the words of the Saviour and still today lends them a freshness as if they had been spoken yesterday. The smaller the value that falls to the oratorical, to the logical-dialectical in a linguistic communication, and the more perfectly plastic-visible the expression stands before the eyes, the easier it becomes for the hearers to render reports that are not word-faithful but matter-faithful concerning what was once heard: the words they may forget, the images remain engraved in the memory. Whoever attentively considers the chapter in Burkitt's book previously cited, in which this scholar presents thirty-one multiply attested sayings of the Lord in their various versions, will discover with astonishment that these differences—which concern partly the wording, partly the accompanying circumstances under which a saying was uttered—exercise little or no transforming influence upon the truth communicated in a parable. The images had been so plastic and penetrating that they remained ineffaceably fixed in the memory; and upon them it depended. The same circumstance explains that the genuine sayings of the Saviour can be translated into all languages of the world without losing their power of effect; whereas, for example, it is very difficult to bring the sense of many expositions of the Apostle Paul exactly to understanding without the aid of the Greek original text, and likewise his images taken from the contemporary life of a Greek harbour-city and from the thought-world of the Hellenistic mystery-religions remain unintelligible without explanation. Jesus' words —mediated through his images—remain accessible to all times and peoples: "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."

One sees: already the mere immersion in the speech of Jesus teaches us much about him—and indeed far more important things than a chronicle of his earthly days could offer; for in this life it comes solely to soul-vision. And at the word soul-vision it occurs to me that a second mathematician, equal to Newton in significance, Blaise Pascal, has pointed us the way to take from the manner of speaking of the Saviour a still deeper glance into his divine essential nature. He writes (Pensées No. 797): "Jésus Christ a dit les choses grandes si simplement qu'il semble qu'il ne les a pas pensées"—Jesus Christ has uttered sublime things with such simplicity that one receives the impression he has not thought them (whereby the emphasis lies upon the word "thought"). This consideration leads into unfathomable depths, and must, I believe, work upon every reflecting mind like a revelation—a revelation of the God-likeness of Jesus.

All the wise have from of old recognised that the thinking of a God cannot be banned and fettered in the forms that are prescribed as boundary to the human brain, especially that the laborious to-and-fro of gradual arising from proof to proof must remain spared to it, and that it must embrace everything at once—somewhat as our eye surveys a whole with one glance. Pascal's remark about the speech of Jesus—as mediator of cognitions that surpass logical thinking—now points us in this direction: namely to the insight that behind the words and the images something other and more than a thinking lies—the super-earthly force of a divine beholding. Here now the consideration of the speech of Jesus links itself with inner necessity to that of his manner of teaching—for the one is conditioned in essential points by the other. The characteristic of the Saviour's manner of working consists in this, that he laid less weight upon teaching than upon living. He chose a small number of men whom he knew how to determine to share his life and thereby to become witnesses of his doing and leaving-undone, of his speaking and silence. In contrast to Buddha, who set before his disciples a whole doctrinal edifice with firstly, secondly, thirdly, and to Mohammed, who wrote down his wisdom as divine revelation and legislation, the Saviour contented himself with the "following"; as Mark says: "He ordained twelve, that they should be with him" (3, 14); that means: the disciples remained day and night about him and thereby received opportunity to experience in what manner he treated the events—as every hour brought them with it: how he healed the sick, comforted the poor, answered the questions of the scribes, associated with people from all layers of society—also with those outlawed as sinners and outcasts—, how he behaved toward non-Jews, how he observed and did not observe the Jewish legal prescriptions, how nothing human escaped his eye—not even the mite which the widow stealthily casts into the poor-box, how his eye lovingly took up God's beautiful nature. Varied experiences could not be lacking, since in contrast to John, the preacher in the wilderness, Jesus—as soon as he entered upon his public office— transferred his home from quiet Nazareth to the populous, lively city Capernaum, where the two main roads crossed which mediated the traffic between south and north as well as between west and east— and that means between the Mediterranean Sea and Damascus. Situated on the shore of the Lake of Gennesaret, the city was the seat of a chief customs-office and of a Roman garrison: here Jesus was "at home," as Mark says (2, 1), and the oldest text of Mark 9, 33 speaks of "his house." From the evangelical reports we gather—as said—that he associated here with all circles of the population, accepted invitations at Pharisees' houses (Luke 7, 36 ff., 11, 37 ff., 14, 1 ff.), had banquets arranged for the despised publicans—"and many publicans and sinners sat at table with Jesus and his disciples, for there were many, and they followed him" (Mark 2, 15)—; at times such a throng of people pressed into his house "that there was no room even before the door" and one had to let down the sick from the roof into the interior (Mark 2, 2 ff.); he also possessed well-to-do adherents in various parts of the country and sought them out with his band of disciples (e.g. Luke 10, 38 ff.). In Capernaum itself, as also on the occasion of the journeys undertaken from there beyond the borders of Galilee, there came about manifold encounters with Greeks, Romans, Samaritans and other non-Jews. And again and again there were intervening days when the little band wandered lonely and the disciples could ask their Master for clarification about the events and sayings that continually aroused their astonishment anew. At the arrest they were all present; some of them attended the judicial proceedings unrecognised (Luke 22, 54 ff.); they watched the end from afar. Of decisive importance is it that these witnesses of his working chosen by Jesus were simple men from the people of slight education; for the work for which he needed them, extensive knowledge and practised thinking would rather have been disadvantages, whereas childlike unbroken imaginative power and popular superstition enabled them to take the miraculous simply as miraculous, to feel the sublime (which the understanding always tends to reduce to its own narrower standards) as something monstrous, and to pass on the many things not understood simply as not understood. I must beg the earnestly willing reader to linger patiently at this point, for here we learn not alone to recognise the secret of the significance of our fourfold Gospel, but therewith we also touch at the same time the centre of the mystery of the appearance of Jesus upon earth—that which Paul calls "the mystery of Christ" (Eph. 3, 4).

In the first chapter we established that our human understanding is absolutely incapable of saying anything about God: we feel, we divine, we sense his presence, we believe in him and know that our being-men is conditioned by this faith and that without him we should immediately sink to the beast,— yet we do not cognise him, and that because none of the forms of thought that are at once limiting and formative for us reaches in this case to apprehension. From this follows now the cognition: God is for us men wholly content, not at all form, not at all shape. Whoever wishes to experience exactly what that means, I refer to two utterances of Goethe's: Thanks be that the favour of the Muses Promises the imperishable, The content in thy bosom And the form in thy spirit. (Duration in Change.) With this first word the reflecting poet describes the two elements, not alone of every work of art, but also of every human conception: without content we have only empty form—a nothing: without form the content remains incommunicable. At another place he has now especially emphasised the outstanding significance of shape for our spiritual life: And only the form ennobles the content, Lends it, lends itself the highest power.

(Pandora, verse 676 ff.) The more appropriate and more perfect the form, the more immediately a noble content works upon understanding and mind. Upon this "ennobling," upon this "highest power" we must now renounce in our considerations about God,—at least renounce so long as our feeling of him is to remain pure, not become figurative and improper. Now, however, the whole message of Jesus consists of two pure thoughts of God: God, our Father, and God's Kingdom is present. Everything else that he occasionally teaches are consequences from these two thoughts of God. If he wished to communicate them purely, he had to strive to charm their inexhaustible content as immediately as possible out of his heart into the hearts of his companions; every form that he chose for the communication could—since it was a matter of God and the divine—only be meant allegorically, and that means improperly; already the images "Father" and "Kingdom of God" are parables: not in the human sense is God our "Father," rather this conception serves only to make a highest measure of belonging, of nearness, of loving care, of forbearance and readiness to help feelable; similar holds of the conception of a "kingdom" borrowed from earthly relations. Jesus chooses the simplest sense-images, yet knows how to vary them so manifoldly that even the most limited head cannot fall into doubt about their purely figurative meaning; he sets forth no theology, he instils faith, yet teaches no articles of faith. One need only consider with some attention the numerous parables which the Saviour employs for the awakening and quickening of that conception which he is accustomed to designate as the Kingdom of God—if one may speak here of a "conception" where it is a matter of content without form. With astonishing boldness ever new images are brought forward, each through inexhaustible power of presentiment pointing new ways and at the same time always with caution, avoiding the crossing of the boundary whereby the mysterious contact of the divine would have to be degraded into a humanintellectual statement. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how." Unthinkably rich are the suggestions which this simple image offers to our reflection: especially this one thing we learn, that in order to enter into the Kingdom of God it depends upon the striking of a definite direction, upon a turning of the will—everything else God alone brings about, as he lets the seed grow, "and the man knoweth not how." A fullness of complementary presentiments the following related parable sets before our eyes: "The kingdom of God is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it grew, and waxed a great tree; and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it." Here as there we behold the Kingdom of God not as a future one, but as a present one; while, however, there it germinated hidden in depths, here it spreads protecting branches over the whole this-side reality. Still more strongly the Lord emphasises the immediate presence of the divine surrounding us when he speaks: "The kingdom of God is like unto treasure hid in a field"—we need therefore only to will: God and his Kingdom are present everywhere, at our feet in the field and over our heads as protecting roof.

In another manner the following image celebrates the transfiguration of the earthly present: “The kingdom of God is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.” If, however, man over against the divine is only receiver, he nevertheless does not attain to participation in it without devoted perseverance: “No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.” Not merely perseverance, passion also is demanded: “The kingdom of God suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.” Not merely this impetuosity, however, but also the exclusive devotion to the one goal is indispensable: “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.” In almost exact contrast to the extreme tension of will that comes to light in these last sayings, it is said another time: “Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven”—whereby evidently the renunciation of all worldly desire and the return into a state of cheerful innocence is demanded as condition for the enjoyment of the immediate nearness of God. Upon this path we arrive at the decisive cognition: “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God”; with the elucidation: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Whoever has taken these parables and the further ones which I have not cited here into himself, whoever hears the voice of the Saviour in them and feels how they mediate the glance of his divine eye, is then ripe for the last revelation, which reaches as far as human words are able: “The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” [Footnote: That the Greek text admits solely the interpretation “within you” is unanimously declared by the decisive specialised scholars of various directions; yet we continually meet from the side of respectable men the assertion that one must read “is in the midst of you.” This untenable opinion is grounded by the reference to the fact that the Saviour is said to have directed these words to Pharisees (Luke 17, 20). To that is to be replied first that the occasion at which a word was spoken remains, as is admitted, always questionable; second, however— and decisively—that such a word is evidently directed to man as such, quite generally (cf. among others Clemen: The Historical Jesus, p. 111).] How grateful must we be to the men who—enabled thereto by unconscious art—have transmitted to us this tidings of the Kingdom of God! Others who—as we are accustomed to say—had possessed “more culture” and more training of the spirit than the evangelists would have been wholly and entirely incapable of mirroring so undistorted pure this teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God—a teaching which the evangelists, as is admitted, did not understand and interpreted to themselves with childish hand-graspability (see e.g. Matt. 18, 1; 20, 21), which, however, did not prevent them from reproducing with a fidelity bordering on the miraculous the unforgettable images which they had received from the mouth of the Saviour. Thereby they have preserved the Saviour himself living for all times. After the death of Jesus we hear the expression “Kingdom of God” seldomer, and we need only to cite the perhaps most beautiful saying of the Apostle Paul concerning this conception in order to feel the mighty distance: “For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men” (Rom. 14, 17). How far do we stand here from the “tree in whose branches the birds of the heaven nest”! The consideration of the speech of the Saviour has led us to the consideration of his manner of communicating himself through parables, and this again has now led us into the interior of his heart. Especially this one thing already lies clear before our eyes: the faith in God and in a Kingdom of God stands for him outside all history. Religion concerns, according to the Saviour, a world beyond space and time, which therefore belongs equally to the past as to the present and the future. To the local question the religion of Jesus answers: “They shall not say, Lo here! or, lo there!”; and to the temporal it escapes by the answer: “Of that day and that hour knoweth no man.”

Never do we find with the Saviour even the beginning of a conceptually firmly circumscribed compulsory article of faith (dogma), which after what has just been said is easy to grasp: an article of faith necessarily always brings a definitely framed intellectual statement and can therefore never be appropriate to a cognition that refers to a transcendent (supra-intellectual) world; not alone will every such article of faith never express the whole truth, rather it will always exclude complementary truths. We saw in the parable of Jesus the Kingdom of God growing up around a man without his doing: "he knew not how"; immediately thereafter, however, we learned of inexorable demands upon his force of will and of direction; one time it was said: the kingdom is stormed, the other time it is accessible only to those who resemble harmless children... and these contradictions are not to be interpreted as if the one held for the one man, the other for the other—all the statements about the kingdom are spoken with general validity. Here, however, I must pause a moment; we shall immediately link on again to the religion of Jesus. This expression namely—the "religion of Jesus"—is contested to us by very significant theologians.

Without question these theologians are right when they assert that the religion of the Christian Church was not taught by Jesus Christ; rather this religion grew up upon him, in order then suddenly after his resurrection to unfold itself with divine power and gradually to gain shape—which, according to ecclesiastical conception, took place under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. According to this view Jesus Christ himself is the object and the content of the religion; he has revealed himself to us in his life and death, and to his life belong naturally in the first rank his words, which we have to know and to revere as divine wisdom and direction; these words contain, however—so the theologians assert—no doctrine of religion; in short: there is no religion that one would be justified in designating as "religion of Jesus." One name may stand for many as evidence; Adolf Harnack writes in his History of Dogma (4th ed. 1, 182): "Jesus has left behind neither a confession nor a doctrine." In this assertion there now lies, according to my conviction, an error reaching into all depths, which from the beginning draws itself through the whole history of Christianity. Certainly the Saviour has left behind no confession and no doctrine in the sense which all theology and all churches attach to these words—that I by no means dispute; yet he has left behind for us a confession and a doctrine of religion whose essence it is that they cannot be forced into any theological church-doctrine; and I mean it would be time to listen to this confession and to this doctrine. Thousands who long for religion feel the impossibility of bringing the teachings and the dogmatic demands of our various churches into a harmonious connection with their remaining concepts, views and presentiments; from all sides one hears the cry for a renewed Reformation, or even for a new religion; men of greater prudence recognise the impossibility of a corresponding transformation of the churches, as also the still-bornness of every supposedly new formation of religion. What makes both impossible is that Jesus of Nazareth, the mediator between God and man, has already two thousand years ago brought us the perfect religion: a religion of pure power of faith, and because pure, therefore undogmatic and antidogmatic, a religion which through the single word "Father" brings God near to our reverent and love-needing mind, a religion of the present "Kingdom of God"—not of an immeasurably distant one, separated from us poor ones by monstrously gaping times of terror: "Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise!" To the consideration of this doctrine of faith of the Saviour the following sections belong. Eusebius therefore read at this place (and he had inherited from his predecessor Pamphilus an especially rich collection of manuscripts) neither a baptismal command at all nor the proclamation of a doctrine of the Trinity (see Conybeare: History of New Testament Criticism, Chap. 5, and Wellhausen: The Gospel of Matthew, p. 152). This verse thus proves itself to be undoubtedly inauthentic; we will not let ourselves be led astray by it. The Saviour's doctrine of God—that is, the doctrine of the Father—is composed of two elements: childlike simplicity and unfathomable profundity. The one element conditions the other: for whoever grasps God's essence too deeply to confuse myth with reality, and too little materialistically to find satisfaction in the conception of a "maker of the universe," has nothing left but either to keep silence with the Indian sage (p. 28), or else to speak out of a childishly pure mind as of a dream-vision; this speaking, however, can in any case only be born out of that silence.

We have already seen in the first chapter that nothing can be stated about God that would possess logically compelling validity and sense before the understanding, because—already according to the concept—God does not belong to the world of appearance and thus everything that is stated of him and about him is only to be understood improperly.

I recall Luther's word: "Yes, who knows what that is which is called God? It is above body, above spirit, above everything that one can say, hear and think." Extremely characteristic is it therefore that the Saviour never undertakes a didactic exposition about the essence of God, that he rather initiates us through a hundred apparently lightly thrown-out remarks gradually into his own relation to "his and our Father," in order therefrom to let everyone guess or gradually after-feel or divine or as by sudden revelation grasp what and who this Father is, "for whose sake he lives" (John 6, 57), and whose never-yielding presence frees him so completely from all the cares of earthly existence that already within this temporality he inhabits the extra-temporal "Kingdom of God" as his true homeland. About a God thus conceived there can be no compulsory article of faith (dogma): he is experienced, or he is not experienced; speaking, teaching, disputing back and forth about him in church councils—all that is excluded. Whoever wishes to experience this God of our Saviour—the Father—must listen to the Saviour's voice: no other is able to mediate here. Even if no one may presume to it, it will nevertheless not be forbidden to lead the still unpractised to attention by highlighting a few main points. Striking, for example, is the decided tone in which Jesus himself repeatedly and distinctly rejects his equation with the Father; for the authenticity of such passages the fact testifies that they soon became painful to the Church and that we already encounter in the Gospels themselves attempts to remodel or to eradicate them. The most striking of these passages reads: "And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God" (Mark 10, 17, 18). This word Luke brings in exactly the same wording (18, 19) and, what is very important, Justin the Martyr—about the middle of the second century—cites it (Apol. I, 16, 7). No man was capable of inventing such a word, which contradicted the conceptions of the developing Church; the ecclesiastical working-over of the Gospel of Matthew later altered it into the embarrassed wording: "Master, what good thing shall I do...?" whereupon the answer follows: "Why askest thou me about that which is good? There is one that is good" (19, 16 ff.). A second word belonging here we heard already earlier (p. 102), where the Saviour, asked about the time-point of the end of the world, replies that he does not know it, that "the Father alone" knows it: this word also the Church has done everything possible to blur or to strike out; fortunately the Mark-text has preserved it for us pure. Whoever pays exact attention will notice similar things at many places, yet I pass them over, not merely in order not to weary, but because Matthew, Mark and Luke all three bring a word which carries the distinction between the Saviour and the Father through into the innermost stirrings of the will: I mean the prayer on the Mount of Olives, which closes with the words: "Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done!" More distinctly one cannot distinguish between personality and personality. A second main point in Jesus' doctrine of God we have to behold in this, that he does not claim the image of sonship for himself alone, but rather applies it ever anew to all men who believe in the Father: whoever feels God as Father cannot do otherwise than recognise himself as son. "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven" (Matt. 23, 9). This conception of a relation of man to God as that of the child to his father was so firmly naturalised by the Saviour among his disciples that it, when the new doctrine of God of the young Church arose, lived on and Paul can still write: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8, 14). More important, however, than everything else is the testimony of John, who indeed writes late, yet precisely in these questions had known his Master more intimately and understood him better than any other man, and it is he who has transmitted to us the eternally memorable words: "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20, 17). Scarcely less noteworthy—especially over against the prejudice still generally prevailing today—is a third point in the doctrine of God of the Saviour: the fact namely that the God whom he designates as "Father" is never confused with the Jewish God, just as little as Yahveh's chosen people of the Jews appears preferred by him. Unwillingly I interrupt our consideration of the religion of the Kingdom of God, yet it is unconditionally necessary—precisely in order to understand the teaching of the Saviour—to know and rightly to judge his relation to the Jewish faith. Let

one therefore permit a short digression upon this subject. First the tone must strike one in which the Saviour is accustomed to speak about the Jews.

Once after the other they are dismissed by him with annihilating irony. On the occasion of the encounter with the Roman centurion Jesus speaks: "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God... But the children of the kingdom (i.e. the Jews) shall be cast out into outer darkness. " (Matt. 8, 10 ff., Luke 13, 29). Still more definite it is said at another place: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21, 43). Deep impression is made by an expression which in most manuscripts—probably on account of its terrifying truthfulness—was softened a little, but which the Syrsin, the Codex Bezae and other good manuscripts have transmitted to us unaltered: there we read Mark 3, 5, the Saviour was "grieved for the hardness (nekrosis) of their hearts"—or (according to some sources) "angered."

Perhaps no opponent of the Jews has ever pronounced so bitter a judgment: deadened hearts! And still a decisive word we possess by which he excludes the Jews from his message, in that he speaks to them: "And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8, 46 ff.). In view of the false position of our churches toward Judaism our clergy is accustomed either to pass over such words in silence, or to hurry as lightly as possible over them; one knows Kant's mockery about the quality of our religious instruction: "One should believe that every Christian must be a Jew" (Rel., p. 252). And so then there is held up to us by our theologians at every opportunity the little sentence-part which by inexplicable by-paths has been smuggled into the conversation with the Samaritan woman: "for salvation is of the Jews" (John 4, 22)—words which Kreyenbühl has rightly designated "as one of the most tasteless and most impossible glosses that have ever not only distorted a genuine text but turned it into its direct opposite" (after Merx). The same man who lets the Saviour speak to the Jews the words: "Ye are not of God," is supposed another time to ascribe to him the utterance: "salvation is of the Jews"! And even in the context of this conversation with the Samaritan woman, whose content consists in the proclamation that the "Father" will no longer be worshipped in Jerusalem, rather that God—in contrast to Yahveh—is "Spirit," and "he seeketh such to worship him as worship in spirit and in truth,"—a conversation that overthrows the Jewish Messiah-concept and ends with the declaration that Jesus is "the Saviour of the world" (soter tou kosmou)! In his Revelation John calls the Jews "a synagogue of Satan" (2, 9): one believes one sees a member of this synagogue as it blackens into one of the most liberating texts of the Gospel such a lie falsifying the whole context. For the Saviour's own mood toward the "prophet-murderers" (Matt. 23, 32) there testify—apart from the many own utterances—the hard words of Paul, whose heart indeed always beats again for the Jewish tribal comrades, so that when he condemns them we have to see a success of the instruction by Jesus; he now says of the Jews: "Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men" (1 Thess. 2, 15) and at another place—where he has in mind the activity of allegedly converted Jews within the Christian community—he utters the warning, worthy to be heard through all centuries: "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision!" (Phil. 3, 2). From this relation of Jesus to the Jews one finds oneself from the outset inclined to presuppose a not very deep-going and binding relation to their edifice of faith; and that with right; for the generally current conception that our Saviour was a pious Jew belongs to the fables convenues of our theologians. Did we possess no further proofs, the one consideration would already suffice for our enlightenment: how should he whose whole essence was pure religion have found satisfaction in a faith that distinguishes itself by a minimum of "religion" among all? (((Moses Mendelssohn)))—the knowing Jew—writes in his "Rescue of the Jews," appeared 1782: "Judaism is not revealed religion, but revealed legislation"; and Immanuel Kant—the just—instructs us: "Judaism, as such, contains, taken in its purity, no religious faith at all"; words that are completed by the following elucidation: "Judaism is properly no religion at all, but merely the union of a multitude of men who, since they belonged to a special tribe, formed themselves into a common being under merely political laws, consequently not into a church... That the name of God is revered does not make this state-constitution into a religious constitution" (Religion p. 186 ff.). In particular about Yahveh and the ten commandments it is then further said at the same place: "A God who merely wills the observance of such commandments, to which no improved moral disposition is required, is yet properly not that moral being whose concept we need for a religion."

It would be superfluous to waste many words here if men were not so inextirpably firmly rooted in their prejudices, even where such offend against all reason and all obviousness. Thus then here again and again the one single place, Matthew 5, 17–20, is brought forward as compelling proof for the Saviour's faithfully Jewish disposition, since according to this he is said to have said "he is not come to destroy the Jewish law," rather "not one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till heaven and earth pass." This word we are to hold for authentic and unambiguous, notwithstanding that it not only contradicts all the teachings of the Saviour, but is also immediately annulled by the text that follows directly upon it. About that more presently; first, however, let the remark be sent on ahead that here a complicated case is present: it is a matter not merely of ecclesiastical text-alterations, but also in the genuine text of specifically Jewish concepts which only through elucidation from the circumstances of the time receive a sense, and indeed a sense that turns the meaning which we of today read out into its opposite. Many theologians hold verses 18 and 19 for interpolations and read accordingly: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (thus e.g. Archdeacon W. C. Allen in his excellent commentary on the Gospel of Matthew).

This solution is a very simple one, and if it satisfies a high ecclesiastical dignitary, the layman may rest content with it; yet I confess that the thorough investigation which Adalbert Merx in his great work on The Four Canonical Gospels dedicates to this place and which leads to another judgment convinces me more: Merx holds verses 18 and 19 (in their oldest presupposable wording) for authentic, but from of old misunderstood, because the knowledge of the Jewish circumstances soon failed the earlier Christians. Earnest seekers I refer to this treatise, whose learning and exhaustiveness exceed by far the claims that I may make upon my readers. One single paragraph I communicate: "Those were the conditions that really prevailed in the circles of the scribes and teachers of the law soon after Jesus, and when he, whom all call Rabbi, worked publicly, what the people expected was nothing other than practical explanation of the law, loosing and binding in the Jewish sense, and precisely that he rejects in Matt. 5, 17. This activity is a subordinate one, whose necessity vanishes simultaneously with the beginning of the kingdom of heaven that Jesus brings, but which will continue —not must—as long as the kingdom of Jesus is not there. Therefore he says that of the law not one jot vanishes, 'till all be fulfilled,' then however it vanishes and a higher one steps into its place, whose principles he has developed in what follows. Now one sees how completely askew the gloss is that this law is to last till heaven and earth pass away; and how Christian interpreters can always again defend this text without noticing into what self-contradictions they fall, that would be incomprehensible if one did not know that the bad habit is not to be removed even with the best logic." Without now entering further into disputed text-questions, let us only attend to the undisputed verse 17, in which the Saviour says he is "not come to destroy, but to fulfil": this fulfilling (Greek plerosai, Latin adimplere) offers an outstanding example of that earnestly smiling irony to which Burkitt earlier drew our attention; for, as the immediately following shows, the Saviour fulfils the Jewish law by contradicting it and abolishing it. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment (and that means of death). But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment [Footnote: The word "without a cause" the oldest text brings.].

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." In this manner one commandment after the other is transformed from an outer rule of behaviour into an inner motive of the heart; yet it does not remain at that: some are turned into their opposite, thus for example the "eye for an eye" and the commandment "Thou shalt hate thine enemy"—for which Jesus teaches: "love your enemies!" Yes, the most important Jewish laws—the sanctification of the Sabbath and the food regulations—are abolished without further ado.

"The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mark 2, 27)—a saying to which one of the best and oldest Graeco-Latin manuscripts brings as decisively important supplement words which the Saviour addresses to a man whom he finds working in the field on the Sabbath: "Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; if thou knowest it not, thou art a transgressor of the law and cursed!" More distinctly the negation of an earlier life-law and the introduction of a wholly new world-view cannot be pronounced. In the same sense liberatingly works the abolition of the food-laws: "And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand: Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Matt. 15, 10 ff.)—to which still the elucidation comes: what goes into the mouth comes into the belly; but what goes forth out of the mouth, that comes out of the heart, and that defileth the man.—All this means an immediate contrast to the "religion" of the Jews, namely to their law which they regard as given by God; it abolishes the law. Not less distinctly shows itself the rejection of Judaism in the repeated, mercilessly sharp appearance of the Saviour against the Pharisees and the scribes; never falls from this otherwise forbearing mouth a reconciling word about them.

They are called "serpents" and "generation of vipers." "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness" (Matt. 23, 27). Now we know exactly, however, that the Pharisees in and for themselves were no bad men, rather in religious relation the best among the Jews, insofar as they took their faith seriously; this party corresponded approximately to the ecclesiastically orthodox among us, and scribes were called the exact knowers of the law, are therefore to be compared with our specialised theologians. Emil Schürer, esteemed in all countries as the first knower of the relevant conditions, writes: "This party is the proper core-people, which distinguishes itself from the remaining mass only by greater strictness and consistency"; and at another place he says: "Pharisaism is the legitimate and classic representative of post-exilic Judaism in general. It has only drawn the consequences from its principles with ruthless energy. Only those are the true Israel who observe the law most punctually. Since this in the full sense only the Pharisees do, only they are the proper Israel" (History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 4th ed. 2, 456 and 472). As one therefore sees, when Jesus rejects Pharisaism with indignation and brands its adherents as "ravening wolves in sheep's clothing," he thereby rejects "the proper Israel." He cannot have the harmless individuals in mind, rather he abhors the whole Jewish system of faith, which he designates as a plant "which my heavenly Father hath not planted" and which therefore "shall be rooted up" (Matt. 15, 13). Under no other assumption can his exceedingly sharp condemnation of the then conversionactivity of the Jews be grasped. Mockingly and scourgingly he cries out: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves" (Matt. 23, 15). One may assert that the Jewish conception of God and of the relation of man to his God—as it gains its purest expression in Pharisaism—forms in everything the exact contrast and opposite pole to that which the Saviour teaches. As Kant earlier made us attentive, and as one can learn from every competent scholar, the socalled Jewish law is a collection of purely formal, outer, mechanical and hair-raisingly arbitrary commandments, without a spark of soul-life, thus without all proper religion. Whoever acted contrary to none of the commandments was called a righteous man—might he be ever so bad a man; after the inner stirring of the heart no question is asked at all, but solely after whether a prescription is transgressed or not—whoever on the contrary leaves unobserved the most trifling and senseless prescription is a sinner. Wellhausen—one of the most reliable specialised scholars of our time—judges about the pious Jews: "They will not do good, but guard themselves from sin; their observation of conventional statutes benefits no one and delights neither gods nor men" (Israelite-Jewish History, 3rd ed., 376). And now I ask, what sense has it when one speaks of Jesus of Nazareth as of a faithful believing Jew, of him who in everything and every particular teaches the exact opposite, for whom the disposition of the heart is everything, who does not fear God as lawgiver but loves him as Father, and finds the Kingdom of God not (as the Jews) as future all-dominion of the Jewish people upon earth, but rather finds it within in the heart of good men?

I hold this generally current assertion not alone for false, but for frivolous and for so misleading that it makes the understanding of the religion of the Saviour impossible. By birth Jesus was a Galilean and as such from the house brought up in the Jewish faith; his contrast to Judaism led him to the cross! Freed from the Jewish incubus, we return to the Saviour's doctrine of the Father and his Kingdom and cry out with Paul: "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice. The Lord is at hand!" (Phil. 4, 4 ff.). The method of the "neti, neti!"—he is not so, and he is not so—which we already came to know in the first chapter, must not be undervalued; by following it we have now gained decisive results: the God of whom Jesus speaks is not the historical Yahveh, the God who chooses himself a robber-people in the wilderness, the "Lord of hosts" (for whom our clergy display an unfailing preference), he is however also not the triune God of our confession of faith,—no word of the Saviour points to this: we heard him repeatedly reject his equation with God—(p. 108 ff.) and on the other side ascribe sonship to all believing men (p. 109). I by no means intend hereby to combat the articles of faith of the churchfounders and refer rather to the presentiment-filled word of Paul: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5, 19)—which the Vulgate renders a little divergently: deus erat in Christo, mundum reconcilians sibi. In the context of this chapter, however, I have solely in mind that which the Saviour himself, according to the testimony of the Gospels, teaches us about God, and there I must establish as indisputable fact that he rejects everything else and as affirmative content of this concept bestows upon us solely and alone the conception of the fatherly—a conception which he does not tire of repeating and so manifoldly, so tenderly, so richly elaborating that it seems to fill the whole visible and invisible world and we, so long as the Saviour speaks, miss nothing and would know nothing more to desire; so long our hearts stand under a magic that lends them that childlikeness which Jesus demands of his hearers (Matt. 18, 3); later, however, understanding and reason raise their irrepressible demands, and the simple conception of the "Father" does not suffice these claims. Then there step forth a Paul and in his train a hundred church-fathers and erect the thousand-pillared temple of faith of the Church, within which the willing man feels sheltered, while many a more living soul beats its wings sore against the dogmatic grating like a captive bird: the Father of whom the Saviour spoke, as also his Kingdom, have vanished from sight! Now the theologians console us—as we already saw above (p. 102 ff.)—with the assurance that Jesus Christ has left behind no doctrine at all, and instead of listening exactly to his message of the Father they remove our mediator from us and bestow upon us confessions of faith which exceed the capacity of every human brain. I almost fear, if Jesus came again to earth, he would once more ward them off with the words: "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered!" In all seriousness the doctrine of God of Christ is reproached—or at least asserted of it—that it forms in its childlike simplicity and with its lack of strictly consequential and systematically building connection nothing further than a richly imaged stimulation for men from the people. Thus for example there lies before me the book of an English specialist, Professor James Orr, on The Christian View of God and the World, in which the proper teaching of the Saviour is briefly dismissed as "entirely devoid of all metaphysical content" and essentially agreeing with the doctrine of God of the Old Testament (p. 77 ff.)! In reality—as already remarked above (p. 107)—the Saviour's teaching of God and the Kingdom of God is just as unfathomable in profundity as divine in simplicity—yes, these two properties belong inseparably together. It is not easy to find from elsewhere an enlightening example for that which is hereby to be said; perhaps, however, we may esteem Immanuel Kant worthy to be named in this connection: with him also profundity and naïve manner of thinking agree. More than once he draws attention to the fact that the deepest result of his reflection—in contrast to all other philosophy—has the peculiarity about it "to be so simple and natural that it is appropriate to the commonest human sense as soon as this is only once led to it" (Critique of Pure Reason, 2nd ed., p. 617): the finest, most deliberate dissection of the human mind—a work that even merely to think after deters most—coincides again exactly with the socalled healthy common sense, only that the reflection with Kant stands on a far higher plane, which brings with it the inestimable advantage not alone of consciousness, of grounding and of clarity, but especially—in consequence of these attainments—

of the unshakable security against the danger constantly threatening reason of nonsense, of madness and of fraud. Highly noteworthy remains in any case this agreement between true simplicity and genuine profundity: if the simplicity is not pure, but artificial or otherwise clouded, and if it is not a matter of deepest reflection but of acuteness and learning, then the named agreement does not take place. We do not understand our Saviour so long as the insight is lacking to us that with him, in a measure for which we otherwise possess no example, simplicity and profundity melt into a complete unity. That Jesus, who so frequently names God, almost exclusively confines himself to the image of the Father and at most still lightly alludes to his goodness, mercy, care etc.—properties that are already contained in the concept of father—testifies to the profundity and for the profundity of his doctrine of God. Everything else that we state about God, what we ascribe to him of perfections, restricts him in reality and draws him down to us men, in that it encloses him within the boundary-walls of our understanding.

I possess a Bible for preachers with alphabetically ordered lists of passages and find therein column-long indications to the word "God," who as eternal, immortal, almighty, all-knowing, omnipresent, glorious, majestic, great, holy, rich, throned on high etc. etc. is to be praised by the church-speakers: with few exceptions all the passages stem from the Old Testament; what the New Testament contains that is usable for this purpose is found, however, in the epistles, whereas the Gospels supply only two passages: "there is none good but one, that is, God," and "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 19, 17 and 5, 48). Scarcely that the Saviour once allows himself the allegory "the finger of God" (Luke 11, 20), and even here the reliability of the report can be doubted insofar as Matthew at exactly the same occasion says "the Spirit of God" (12, 28): every materialisation is carefully avoided and thereby a conception of God is taught that stands in immediate contrast both to the historically tangible God of the Jews—who on the Sabbath, surrounded by rabbis, studies in the Torah—and to the sublimely throning mythical Trinity of the Christian Church. This must ever again be emphasised, because it remains unnoticed by all theologians and yet is fundamental for the understanding of that which the Saviour calls "Kingdom of God," and therewith also for his teachings—for these all have reference to the Father and his Kingdom. What a Plato and a Kant attained through long years of uninterrupted reflection, borne by so high a gift that it was designated as "divine," as reward of their noble endeavours, of that Jesus Christ was immediately conscious, yes, so immediately that we see him live and weave in this consciousness: it is a matter of the cognition that outside and beside this our life in time and space with everything that our imaginative power adds thereto of the supra-temporal and supra-spatial—of eternities, of heavens and hells, of works and wonders—that outside this life there is another, a higher, a more immediate life, where past and future do not, torn asunder by the delusion of time, flee one another, nor here and there are distinguished. This other life may not be designated as "future"—say in the sense of the paradise promised by the Church, which yet means merely a continuation of our sensual world on a transfigured stage after death—rather already today the world of timelessness and spacelessness as also of the loosing from the conceptual schemes innate to us surrounds us; what we lack is solely the reflection upon it, for we live as in a frenzy, and few men ever gain for themselves a moment of true inner repose for reflection upon themselves and the double-world surrounding them; and this reflection also leads to no result if it is not cultivated in earnest patience and guided by mighty spirits. Yet it is found that pure, simple minds attain by another, shorter path to the same goal —not indeed in regard to a conscious grasping, yet in regard to the determination and the quickening of the mind—and this was the direction which the Saviour struck toward his hearers, and that with the success that he could cry out: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes!" (Matt. 11, 25). The deepest insight into this teaching of Jesus concerning the "second life," which surrounds our first given "first life" and into which we can every day step over and enter, has John granted us, that apostle whose pure heart had understood the Master by far the best. John lets Jesus seldom speak of eternal life, rather simply of "life": the man "lives" only when he has entered into the Kingdom of God; this entry, however, happens simply through that which the Saviour calls faith: "he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live" (11, 25).

A second word of the Lord shows with especial distinctness in what degree Jesus perceives this our temporality as girded about by the divine timelessness: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (5, 24). To our Saviour accordingly this earthly life counts as related to death; he, however, "is passed (immediately) into life" who believes in God in the sense of Jesus, and therewith the concept of time and every temporal conception vanishes for him: "he shall not come into condemnation"—all such conceptions as that of the "Last Judgment" possess only figurative significance. Such a word was never spoken before and has never been spoken since; no man was capable of inventing it.

My readers and I, we pursue no theology and have it, in order to understand our Saviour, not needful— on the contrary: could we only bring it so far as to take up his words in pure simplicity into our hearts, we should possess everything that is needful to us; in order however to be able to do that, we should have to throw the whole ballast of the later added—at least temporarily—overboard; and that precisely falls hard upon us, to the point of impossibility: our mind is darkened by century-old thought-cobwebs. An example. Whoever has only a little read or heard about religion will immediately interpose upon my above expositions the question: does the author thereby mean to say that Christ taught a transcendent God, no immanent one? (To the uninformed let it serve for enlightenment that Kant germanises transcendent with "over-flying" and immanent with "in-dwelling"; he can also think of Goethe's distinction between a God "who only thrusts from without" and one who "moves the world in the interior.") Such a question is here wholly objectless, and one could at most answer: the Father in whom Jesus bids us believe is at once transcendent and immanent. In reality the profundity of this thinking leaves every such logical dilemma far behind it. That other world is just as much in us as outside us, therefore one must say of this God: he surrounds us, and at the same time he permeates us. Yet all that is already only figuratively spoken; into what another kind of feeling, thinking and understanding every word of the Saviour transfers us! thus for example the one whispered into the ear of his beloved John: "No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us" (1 John 4, 12). Indeed we must learn to read carefully; for the later church-teachers have—manifoldly probably half unconsciously and involuntarily, obeying a suggestion—remodelled the words of the Saviour that refer to the Father, to suit their views, wherever they only could. Again let a single example suffice to make the reader attentive. Both in the oldest preserved text of the Gospel of John, Chapter 6, verse 45 ff., as also in later manuscripts, we find the following words of identical wording: "And they shall be all taught of God"; thereto in the oldest text joins itself the sentence: "It is not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on God hath life." That is unmistakably clear spoken with reference to all men and means: No man has beheld the Father with bodily eyes, yet it can figuratively be asserted that "he which is of God" has seen the Father, namely recognised him; this recognition is won by faith, and whoever possesses it, first he has true life—a life that no death threatens, because it already within this temporality consciously grasps the timeless. In the later ecclesiastical text it has succeeded, through trifling alterations which the cursorily reading one scarcely notices, to bend the sense in such a way that the generally spoken words "but he that is of God, he hath seen the Father" now refer to the Saviour alone as Son of God. For now we read: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." Whereto in the second part the corresponding alteration joins itself: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth hath everlasting life"—thus not "he that believeth on God," but he that believes what the Church teaches! and not simply "hath life," but receives for his orthodoxy as reward "everlasting (thus still temporally thought) life." [Footnote: Cf. also A. Merx: The Four Canonical Gospels, at the relevant place.] In this manner the profundity of the teaching of the Saviour is lost—and with it at the same time the simplicity and the immediacy; in place of these we receive a cosmic myth, a contradictory Christology, an arsenal of theological articles of faith and the mediation of priestly claims: all that, thanks to a small shift of wording by which copying monks sought to bring sayings that appeared dark to them nearer to their understanding.

Let the reader of the Gospel therefore remain on guard! Jesus has said that "the truth" which he teaches "shall make us free" (John 8, 32): every teaching that strikes us into chains we should—warned by the Saviour—meet with mistrust! We should scarcely be in a position to recognise the doctrine of God of the Saviour with certainty—so manifoldly have his words suffered under the incomprehension of earlier and later text-editors—had he not completed it through the teaching of the Kingdom of God, for which more graspable and more manifold images stood at his disposal, which his hearers—even if they did not divine the deeper content—were nevertheless able to mark well and to reproduce faithfully. We have already treated of this above with some exhaustiveness (p. 99 ff.) and perceived that this Kingdom is conceived completely "transcendent" (extra-worldly), bound to no space—one will not say "Lo here! or, lo there!"—nor to any time; rather it is present to the knowing one and can surprise the unknowing one at every moment. In this case also, despite the unambiguity of the texts, much has from the very beginning been done toward the re-interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. The fact that the Jews expected a Kingdom of Yahveh upon earth already led the immediate disciples into confusions; soon there was added the conception, taking up ever more space, of a Kingdom of God in heaven, whither man after his death, in a more or less transfigured corporeality, hoped to arrive—and that not immediately at his death, but at the "end of the world"; finally—stimulated by the work of Augustine widely diffused through centuries, De Civitate Dei—the thought took root with many that the Kingdom of God is the Kingdom of the Catholic Church ruling the world. It needs scarcely any proof for my readers that none of these conceptions touches at any point the teaching of the Saviour concerning the Kingdom "that is within us." Yet, in order to make this still more convincingly feelable, let us cast a glance upon the Saviour's attitude toward the fact of sin—an attitude that remains wholly unintelligible so long as his teachings of God and of the Kingdom of God have not been grasped in their simplicity and their profundity. One may open whatever theological book one will, always one will find the author embarrassed and secretly horrified that Jesus makes little ado about sin; as quickly as possible the theologians are accustomed to hurry past this for them questionable fact in order as soon as possible to arrive at Paul and the primitive Christians, where they again feel at home in the atmosphere of sin, of the forgiveness of sins and of the redemption from the guilt of sin. The good and the evil, virtue and guilt all peoples knew; yet the juridically sharp elaboration of the concept of sin is the work in the first rank of the Egyptians, then however especially of the Jews, from whom we have taken it over. And sin hangs inseparably close together with the concept of the God-given law. A God who, like the Jewish one, has issued numerous laws that encompass the entire life and impose upon men duties upon duties, thereby creates at the same time the sins which the law is to ward off. Paul writes: "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead" (Rom. 7, 7 ff.). In the sequel sin took up an increasingly broader space in the thought-world of the Christian Church, until finally "through Augustine the consciousness of the universal sinfulness has become the exclusive negative fundamental mood of Christendom" (Harnack, D. G., 4th ed., 1, 71). What enormous significance the conception of sin possesses in Martin Luther's religious life everyone knows: "Sin treads us under foot," he writes from his own most personal experience, "until grace comes and treads sin under foot." And in our days the theologian among the theologians, Albrecht Ritschl, has set up the proposition that "the value of the achievement of Christ and the unvalue of sin" are "thoroughly correlate magnitudes," i.e. equal to one another in significance (Justification and Reconciliation, 4th ed., 1, 217). Nowhere now does the un-Jewish and anti-Jewish in our Saviour strike one more than in the question of sin; he also stands thereby in a pronounced contrast to all Christian churches—which all treat sin and justification as centre and as driving-force of the religions taught by them. On the contrary it is characteristic for Jesus that in general he prefers the sinners to the righteous—a striking fact which Luther thus explains: "It happens in order that the honour may be wholly ascribed to God the Lord, for this reason, that out of grace and pure mercy he forgives the sin" (Concordance 4, 296). Everyone must feel, however, how insufficient this explanation is, which stands strongly under the influence of Old Testament conception. Also the answer which Jesus himself occasionally of a

reproach about his association with "sinners" grants: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. ... I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matt. 9, 12 ff.)—this answer bears more the character of a defence than of a ground-reaching information: first the expression "righteous" is to be understood Jewishly, and the saying therefore means one of the many rejections of the Jewish law; yet numerous words, especially in the parables, prove that a still deeper sense lies hidden therein. The Saviour pursues a single goal: to introduce men into the Kingdom of God; this happens by means of an enlightenment of the mind, accompanied by a turning of the will; and now it is found that "sinners" are more receptive for the enlightenment and more willing for the turning of the will than "non-sinners." The religion of Jesus stands namely—as already set forth—outside time and therefore asks only after the present: this extinguishes the past, or rather transforms its significance in a twinkling. The criminal who dying addresses to the Saviour the words "Remember me" is subjected to no interrogation, nor is any penance imposed upon him in this world or in the beyond, rather it is said: "Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23, 42 ff.). In the moment where the turning takes place, his misdeeds are extinguished: "For I came not to judge the world, but to save the world" (John 12, 47). If the case of the malefactor—as an all-too special one—does not convince or is doubted, then consider that of the adulteress (which, characteristically, the Church has done its best to strike out of the text—cf. Merx and Rendel Harris).

After upon the word of the Saviour: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her," the accusers have one after the other stolen away, Jesus speaks to the adulteress: "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more" (John 8, 2–11). Even if that were true which some scholars conjecture, that here a parable lies, not an event, the word itself—and upon that alone it depends—belongs to the undoubtable ones; for it means a blow in the face not alone of all Jewish legislation and feeling, but not less of every Christian-church teaching and custom from the earliest times on to the present day. The sin is simply not reckoned to the woman; of repentance, penance and punishment we likewise hear nothing; "sin no more": that suffices. To this example another joins itself appropriately. The Saviour sits at table with a rich man; then there approaches a "sinful woman" known throughout the city for her unchaste life, falls upon her knees before the Saviour, "ceases not to kiss his feet," and then anoints them for him with fragrant oil; thereupon understandable indignation of the house-owner and his guests and astonishment that the Saviour does not ward off from himself the touch of such a woman. He, however, takes her under his protection and proclaims: "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much," and to the woman he speaks: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke 7, 36–50). One look further around and note in what measure various sayings and especially parables of the Saviour in regard to sin run contrary to our ecclesiastical moral teachings and in general to the conceptions of morality current among us. Were the word, for example, not familiar to us from childhood, everyone would have to start when he hears: "Likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance" (Luke 15, 7): here nevertheless without circumlocution preference is given to the—according to our human concepts—sinful over the virtuous! And of such parables there are several. Also the parable of the lost son belongs here: we hear it gladly because it is so beautiful, none the less it contradicts just as much our religious as our worldly ideas and habits. Exactly the same as with sin we observe with its counterpart, the good work: the alleged merit the Saviour is accustomed to estimate, just like sin, as secondary. For this testifies, for example, the parable of the lord of the vineyard who in the evening pays all his labourers the same wage, whether they had been active from early morning and "have borne the burden and heat of the day," or whether they had taken part in the work only a single last hour. To the murmuring day-labourers he answers: "Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" (Matt. 20, 1–16). One note that the Saviour expressly designates this narrative as "a parable of the Kingdom of God." Not otherwise stands it with the parable of the servant who returns weary and hungry from the field and must first prepare the meal for his lord and wait upon him before he himself may rest and eat. "Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him?

I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do" (Luke 17, 7–10, according to the oldest text). So definitely and sharply does Jesus reject—not indeed the good works themselves, yet the conception that they constitute "a merit" and found a claim: hereby, however, a further part of our ecclesiastical doctrine of religion falls. Even if in these expositions, as everywhere, I can only proceed by hinting, I hope nevertheless that every reader begins to grasp what metaphysical depth distinguishes the doctrine of religion of the Saviour before the teachings of the churches.

It is true—as earlier discussed—this teaching of the Saviour is presented with inimitable simplicity and thereby gains power over simple hearts; it also possesses in another, deeper relation simplicity without equal: to the teacher a world of unfathomable depth of thought is so familiar, he feels himself so at home in it, that he does not even find himself occasioned to approach a thought-corresponding (metaphysical) presentation and in perfect simplicity presents things which the wisest man can scarcely grasp. Foolish, however, is it to overlook the depth over the simplicity; whither this leads we know: to the assertion that Jesus has left behind no doctrine at all (p. 102 ff.). By no means do I wish to give to understand that, in order to receive the blessing that radiates from the teaching of the Saviour, it is indispensable to descend into the deepest depths of the human capacity of thought; among us of today, however, pure simplicity is a rare gift, and whoever does not possess it must already resolve to strike the other path—the path of reflection—otherwise no access remains to him to the message of Jesus; moreover one will discover that precisely the very deepest thinking leads back to simplicity. Hardly can one gain insight into the metaphysical depth of the teaching of the Kingdom of God—as Jesus presents it in his parables—and into the whole world-view and lifeconception connected therewith who has not enjoyed instruction with the greatest thinkers of the East —Badarayana and Sankara—as also with the greatest thinkers of the West—Plato and Kant; scarcely a man among many millions is capable of arriving at such cognitions out of his own force and own impulse,—rather we cannot dispense with the guidance of these rarest thinkers who have thought before us all. Especially the Indian sages possess for us in this case particular value, because their whole thinking serves exclusively a religious interest; however deeply they may immerse themselves in the laws of human thinking and experiencing and dissect them ever so unprecedentedly finely, their sole motive for this labour and their never lost-from-sight goal is and remains the "redemption"—the redemption from a world of appearance, of error and of sin; this redemption is, however—exactly as with Jesus — thought as attained through an inner turning-about (rebirth), thanks to which the man suddenly becomes aware of the presence of God and thereby enters into his Kingdom: the expression "Kingdom of God" may not occur with these sages, the concept, however, essentially covers itself with that which the Saviour attaches to this word. And so we find there also the teaching that upon entry into the Kingdom of God the committed sins as also the merits detach themselves and dissolve. Whoever beholds that Highest and Deepest, For him the knot of the heart splits, For him all doubts resolve themselves, And his works become nothing. In particular this holds of sin. "As water does not cling to the leaf of the lotus-blossom, so no evil deed clings to him who knows such," and: "As the panicle of the reed, stuck into the fire, burns, so all sins (of the knowing one) burn." This teaching is all the more remarkable as at the same place the continuance of punishment and reward, of performance of penance and annihilation of guilt is expressly emphasised, only these things hold solely within the world of sense and of understanding, whereas the "knower of God" has already entered into the other world, in which the significance of our life—now recognised as lying outside space and time—is beheld under a new viewpoint: "Also of the good work it holds just as of the evil that with the (God-)knower it is annihilated and does not cling to him; why? because also the good work conditions a corresponding retribution and thus would hinder the fruit of the cognition (of God); therefore the scripture in words like 'he overcomes both' teaches the annihilation of the good work as well as of the evil (with the knower of God)" (Sankara, The Sutras of the Vedanta, 4, 1, 13 and 14).

What our Saviour from divine height grasps with a single glance and therefore pronounces with perfect simplicity, thither—to this cognition—we see here men honestly wrestling for the truth in unceasing thought-labour climb laboriously upward. The path which they struck could never lead to a full success; their work failed through the monstrosity of the claims placed upon the thinking-force of men; God and the Kingdom of God had to step before our eyes in the person of the mediator if they were to become accessible to every human mind; none the less we will beware of leaving such a high-point of holy-earnest human striving after God and his Kingdom unnoticed aside: the profundity of Indian research into God is suited to open our eyes for the divine simplicity of the teachings of Jesus, past which we dazzled ones go heedlessly, in that we imagine we see nothing for pure light.

The thinkers of the West stood not in the service of religion but in that of science; therefore we find with them no such immediate relations to our subject. Nevertheless for many among us Kant's Critique of Pure Reason will form the right preparation for the understanding of Jesus' preaching; for Kant alone leads into the world of the timeless present in which the thinking of the Saviour lives. The reader I cannot spare the labour of ascending to the source; were I to undertake to instruct him, the attempt would necessarily fail: such cognitions cannot be made palatable for lazy spirits, they must be worked out. One note in Kant's principal work above all the great section: Of the empirical use of the regulative principle of reason in regard to all cosmological ideas. Here one learns to see exactly the difference between the world of the senses and of necessity on the one side and on the other the world of freedom: in the world of freedom Jesus was at home, out of it everything that he teaches about God and God's-Kingdom is to be thought spoken. Even if Kant in that work otherwise does not take the moral questions into consideration, he nevertheless finds himself occasioned to make us attentive in a note to the following fact: "The proper morality of the actions (merit and guilt) remains therefore wholly hidden from us, even that of our own behaviour. Our imputations can only be related to the empirical character. How much of it, however, is pure effect of freedom, how much of mere nature and of the unmerited fault of the temperament, or of its fortunate constitution (merito fortunae), no one can fathom, and therefore also not judge according to complete justice" (1st ed., p. 551). Solely out of this consideration can the behaviour of the Saviour toward the sinners and the sins be understood. To everyone the word will immediately occur: "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (Matt. 7, 1)—a word with which no church knows what to do, since it overthrows our current conception of "sin"—as of a given and easily to be judged fact. The complete agreement with Kant becomes still clearer from the saying reported in the Gospel of John: "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man" (8, 15, vos secundum carnem judicatis: ego non judico quemquam). "After the flesh" is a turn which as easily graspable expression corresponds exactly to the concept of the "empirical character" philosophically firmly determined by Kant; the explanation "I judge no man" (thus runs the genuine Luther-text) springs from the same conviction as Kant's: "the proper morality of the actions remains wholly hidden." In the same connection I draw attention to a further word of Kant's: "for a holy will no commandments hold" (Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals, 2nd section). This teaching corresponds literally to the Indian one, according to which the concepts good and evil find no application to a holy man; I mean, however, only in this light does much with the Saviour become intelligible, thus e.g. when, in face of death, an inner turning transforms the criminal on the cross, and Jesus in the same moment sees all misdeeds fall away from him as if they had never been; or when the adulteress, under the impression of the eye and the voice of Jesus, likewise experiences such a new birth that the Saviour, without a word of blame, can dismiss her: go and sin no more. With these hints about the conception of sin I hope to have opened the eyes of many a reader to the pure doctrine of religion of the Saviour in distinction from—almost one could say in contrast to—all "Christian" church-teachings. Once become attentive, everyone will grow ever deeper into this new world of the Father and his Kingdom, or rather this new world will like the tree of the parable (p. 99) grow up around him into the height and surround him: without his rightly knowing how it has gone, he will find himself sheltered in the Kingdom of God and rescued from human fears.

This religion of Jesus is the simplest that was ever proclaimed, at the same time the most tolerant: it requires no outer apparatus at all, since it addresses itself solely to the inner man, nor does it shake at existing customs. Thus we have, for example, seen in what immediate contrast the teaching of the Saviour stands to Judaism, and we know the bitter words in which the loving one frequently remembers the priests and scribes of that people; nevertheless he himself remained within this community in whose midst he had grown up, and gave his disciples an example—if not of the observance of the laws, which he, as we know, broke where it seemed good to him—yet of the faithful holding-fast to the time-honoured religious customs. Equally noteworthy is it that we never hear him address to the heathen, with whom he comes manifoldly into contact, a blaming or depreciating word about their religion, rather often experience that he praises precisely heathen on account of the force of their faith—"the like of which he has not found in Israel."

If the Saviour lays little weight upon the religious affiliation of men, he demands just as little from them any restrictions in regard to their state and professional obligations: all these things are indifferent, since Jesus asks solely after a transformation of the disposition. The word: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's" (Matt. 22, 21) belongs to the best-known, yet perhaps few reflect what is thereby pronounced. The Jews contested with passion the claims of the Roman Empire; especially the Galileans found themselves at that time almost constantly in uprising; to recognise the legitimacy of the imperial government meant to deny one's own theocracy and to abandon the claims of the Jews to world-dominion: all this Jesus does with that answer which he calmly and definitely grants the questioners. If the Saviour is content with every political world-order, so also no situation of life counts for him as hindrance for the inner transformation to be striven after. Very striking is it that Jesus preaches no world-renunciation of any kind, which otherwise was the case with every religious renewer, and so especially also with his own contemporary, John the Baptist. The contrast to this he even once expressly emphasises, in that he says John has renounced bread and wine (practised strictest abstinence), whereas he, Jesus, lives so freely that it is said of him: "Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (Matt. 11, 19, Luke 7, 34). In this connection I draw attention that the Gospel of Luke assigns two words to John the Baptist which cannot belong to him and were certainly spoken by the Saviour. The one is directed to the publicans—a fellowship that on account of its unclean business-conduct fell into general contempt (see for more Schürer)—and answers the question what they are to do in order not to be found unworthy of the Kingdom of God: "Exact no more than that which is appointed you"—thus be honest! Not a syllable more. The second word answers the same question, posed by soldiers: "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages" (3, 12 ff.). If one now considers the fundamental rejection of the military profession on the part of the Jews as also the early-Christian shyness of bloodshed, which in our days led to the extravagances of a Tolstoy, one grasps the significance of such a word and its close relation to the doctrine of religion of the Saviour. Similar stands it in regard to his judgment of the soul-dangers which the possession of earthly goods brings with it. He does indeed speak the word: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Mark 10, 25); he adds, however, immediately: "With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible," and in the preceding verse, where we now read: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" one read in an earlier text: "How hardly shall they that trust in riches enter into the kingdom of God"—whereby again all emphasis is shifted back upon the inner disposition: it does not depend upon whether one is rich, but upon his conception of the significance of his riches. This also emerges from another place where the Saviour is said to have spoken of the "deceitfulness of riches, which choke the word"—so we read hitherto (Matt. 13, 22), and the word served ascetic preachers as text.

Now, however, newer researches and discoveries have only now procured for us an exact knowledge of the then popular Greek, the language in which the writings of the New Testament are composed, and there it turns out that the word apate in the Hellenistic time no longer meant as earlier "deceit," but pleasure, enjoyment; consequently the Saviour has not asserted that the goods of this world are in all cases a deceit and choke the word, rather that this happens when the riches serve solely for enjoyment, instead of being administered as an entrusted good bestowed by God for noble purposes (cf. Milligan, N. T. Documents, p. 75). We know moreover that Jesus not only accepted invitations from rich houses, but that he was closely befriended with well-to-do families and permitted them "to minister unto him of their substance" (Luke 8, 3). Only when we call all these things to mind and without any ecclesiastical prejudice maturely consider what they mean does the understanding for words like: "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light" (Matt. 11, 30) open to us. One consider what an unbearable "burden" the post-exilic law had imposed upon the unhappy Jewish people; no wonder if Nehemiah must report: "And all the people wept, when they heard the words of the law" (Chap. 8–10). Not small, however, is also the "burden" which the Christian churches impose upon the consciences: there are outer commandments in abundance, customs that are said to be indispensable for the salvation of the soul; far worse, however, I esteem the soul-torment of the compulsion of faith in a hundred incomprehensible things, under threat of eternal punishments. Of all that we find with Jesus no trace: he simply demands that everyone feel the presence of the Father and "become merciful, as the Father is merciful"; upon this path "we become the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil" (Luke 6, 35 with drawing-in of the oldest text). The reader will probably of himself gradually have had the conviction forced upon him that this teaching of the divine Father and of the Kingdom of God stands outside everything that we men are otherwise accustomed to represent to ourselves as "religion" and as "church"; he has, however, at the same time learned to perceive that it is by no means a matter of a mere moral teaching; rather one is spurred on to a highest intensification of living power of faith, and only when this has led the man into the immediate presence of the Father does there result therefrom a deep-reaching transformation that is to be compared with a new birth. However new the message also is which the Saviour brings to men, and however hard it therefore also falls to annex it to any appearances of the life of the mind more familiar to us, it helps nevertheless very much to a fuller understanding when one becomes attentive that men out of the Aryan kinship have at different times and at different places, under the straining of all forces of spirit, striven after that which Jesus taught and lived in perfection. In order to convince himself of that, let the reader look up the place in the first chapter about the wholly pure concept of God as the Aryan Indians and the Aryan Germans have grasped it, about the God whom Master Eckhart calls "a remaining thought in the soul" (p. 28). Exalted above all these groping attempts of noble longing ones stands Jesus of Nazareth—he who does not seek, but "speaks that which he knows" (John 3, 11); yet one feels oneself there as here blown about by the same air and experiences whither one has to turn if one wishes to approach the Saviour upon human paths. Those men also strive with their seeking of God after something other than what their religions offer them, and praise themselves happy when they reach mystical depths in which all forms and formulas fall away from their burdened conscience and they feel the presence of the highest good being, the Father. These poor ones, however, root so inextricably firmly in complicated religious conceptions that they wind themselves out only with extreme labour, without ever being able to reach the full unboundness,—always there stood and still stands today a last separating wall between these men and their goal; whereas the Saviour in perfect freedom floats down from above and out of this perfected mastery the simplicity and simplicity of his unfathomably deep teaching yields itself of itself. He constructs no structure of articles of faith, founds no church, teaches no customs and exercises of devotion by which a God is to be made gracious, he looks solely to an actual movement in the soul-life of the man, to an actual upward-striving of his will to the Higher (p. 27 ff.) which the man divines and knows above himself, to a decided seizing of the hand of God; therefore he asks not out of which region of human delusion-thoughts the individual may come, nor does he condemn the various learned religious customs: what to us—caught in space and time—

appears decisive is for him without significance; he pursues a single goal: to introduce us into the presence of the Father—and that means into the Kingdom of God. Hither the way stands open from every direction; and arrived here, everything else falls away, because the man through this deed as a transformed one has entered into the timelessness: this deed, this event the Saviour calls faith, and of it the sayings hold: "Be not afraid, only believe!" (Mark 5, 36) and: "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth" (Mark 9, 23 according to the oldest text). Afterword I break off here; for it is a matter of things that can only be hinted at and with which—as I have convinced myself through the attempt—exhaustiveness, by heaping words and images, weakens and obscures the impression of the unspeakable: if what has been said suffices to lead some to Jesus himself, then my expositions have fulfilled their purpose. A few words shall strike a bridge from this consideration of the Saviour and his teaching to the three following chapters about that which men made out of this appearance and this teaching, and out of which the ecclesiastical religion arose which we call Christianity.

To take it briefly beforehand: the teaching of Jesus vanished because ununderstood; yet its proclaimer remained, and therewith the living source of divine blessing was preserved for mankind. The Father, of whose immediate nearness Jesus had wished to convince us, now throned in world-distances, and the Kingdom of God, after which we needed only to bend in order to possess it, the Kingdom that already in this life surrounded us like a tree in whose branches merry little birds sang, was first to open itself to us long after death and after the most terrible judgment that threatened eternal punishments; also Jesus himself moved ever farther from us —as Christ: first he was called "the image of the invisible God" (an in and for itself rather dark expression),— scarcely, however, stand these words upon the paper when they no longer suffice the writer, and Jesus Christ himself becomes the world-creator, "all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist" (Col. 1, 15 ff.); yet beside Christ the God there remained—thanks to the Gospels —Jesus the Son of Man; he was the mediator, and thenceforward men believed in God "through Jesus Christ." In this word—as already earlier remarked (p. 79)—lies enclosed the whole blessing of the Christian churches: the inner power of this appearance conquers over every distortion, over every human delusion-thought, over all primitive-priestly conceptions from the childhood of mankind which we drag further as ballast—and ever anew this appearance stands there, radiant in its simplicity and repose,—untouchable. To it flees out of the various confessions whoever is only capable of receiving religious blessing—and he receives it, no matter what else of superstitious by-work he may have burdened upon his poor striving soul. Within the earliest, still becoming Christianity the mediatorship of Jesus led to interpretations whose difference is today overlooked by most: thus for example the three first evangelists linked on to generally current conceptions in the people, especially to that of an expected God-sent hero who was to re-erect the Kingdom of David—of the "Messiah" (in Greek: Christ), whereas Paul—introduced by the rabbis into the art of scripture-interpretation and at the same time from early youth surrounded by Hellenistic religious conceptions—undertook to re-poetise the whole Old Testament into a new worldmyth in which Jesus from beginning to end forms the middle figure, whereby the concept of the Messiah is wholly transformed. John for his part joined himself to the Hellenistic Gnosis in order to be able to combat it all the more effectively, and grasped Jesus as the embodied Logos. Since these three conceptions remained standing side by side—thereto as a fourth the figure and teaching of the genuine Jesus preserved by the Gospels—there arose in the church-doctrine an insoluble confusion; yet one thing was common to all: the mediatorship of Jesus Christ between man and God, and this remained and remains the religious pivot of every true Christianity.

V. **Paulus**

My life is Christ. (Paul the Apostle)

"Paul must – after Jesus – be recognised as the creator of the churches that are in Christ": so judges about the year 220 the acute and learned Origen (*Contra Celsum*, Book I, Chap. 63). These words – as soon as one knows how to grasp them exactly and deeply – supply the core-thought for everything that in the connection of the present book it is necessary to say. Into the labyrinth of the actual "theology" of the Apostle to the Gentiles we have no occasion to venture, rather we will beware of it. For nearly two thousand years the theologians of God have disputed about this theology without ever finding a unanimously acknowledged conclusion, which must also remain eternally impossible, because it is Paul himself who sets up the contradictory. Bishop Lightfoot – whom we have already earlier often met as one of the most outstanding English researchers in this field – summarises his judgment on Paul in two words: *consistently inconsistent* (*Gal.*, p. 355) – an expression that might be rendered approximately by "consistently inconsistent" or "consequent in consequent." What with Paul represents the outflow of simple truthfulness, in that he does justice to the different requirements of his personality by different paths, transforms itself into violence and untruthfulness as soon as ecclesiastical power-holders weld it into a unitary structure with general compulsory validity: thereby harmony becomes discord, and in contrast to the peace that had been found in God there rages through the centuries never-ending strife.

Fortunately these discussions, as said, lie outside our field of vision: it suffices us if we gain a purely human, clear conception of the connection between Paul and Jesus Christ. Already with this simple posing of the question we find ourselves confronted by such entangled relations that only methodical disentanglement can lead us to the goal: to accomplish this within very modestly drawn limits would be the purpose of our fifth chapter.

When in the *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* I expressed the conjecture that Paul perhaps did not stem from purely Jewish race, that the assumption lay near that his mother was a Hellenic or half-Hellenic proselyte, I experienced from the side of our theologians fierce, almost embittered contradiction; and yet I had been moved to this conjecture by the most cogent of all reasons, namely by the character- and spirit-properties of the man himself. At that time I did not divine that this conjecture has frequently been pronounced since the first Christian century, and indeed by those who must have had the best judgment on the question, namely by the Jews and the Jewish Christians. Also what Jerome narrates (*De vir. ill.*, 5) deserves attention: he asserts that Paul's parents had not originally belonged to the Diaspora in Tarsus, but that they had been at home in a little town of northern Galilee,

Gischala, and had emigrated only after the birth of Paul: in the "heathen district," however, as we know (p. 91), very few genuine Judaean Jews lived. Whether now Paul beheld the light of the world in Galilee or in Cilicia, there was here as there opportunity enough for blood-mixture, and if inner reasons speak for this, it is ridiculous and thoroughly unscientific, out of mere instilled prejudice, to reject this possibility curtly. Paul would nevertheless according to the custom of the time have had the right to regard himself as a full-blooded Jew – for which I refer to Merx (*Evang.*, Part 2, 1, 37), so that his assertions in this regard (*Acts* 23, 3, *Rom.* 11, 1, *Gal.* 3, 15? wait, actual references as given) prove nothing against the blood-mixture.

Be that, however, as it may! for certainty we shall never experience about it. The concept "race" concerns in general a totality, whereas the origin of the individual always conceals unsearchable secrets. As Paul himself remarks: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly... but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly" (*Rom.* 2, 28). Paul may stem from wherever he will, his working lies open before our eyes, and its fundamental essence and fundamental result consists in this, that he tore Christianity as a new appearance loose from Judaism and separated it: thereby he became "creator of the churches that are in Christ."

The unconquerable Jew-love of our clergy of the various confessions has hitherto kept this mid-point of his life-work hidden from us laymen; it forms for them at all times a heart's concern to behold in Jesus and Paul pure Jews whose whole thinking is to be explained out of the Jewish peculiarity. And if heaven once grants us a truly great scholar who, equipped with all the weapons of knowledge and of spirit, represents another conception, then misfortune will have it that precisely he misrecognises the essence of the great Apostle: Paul de Lagarde sets up in his *German Writings* (p. 56 ff.) the untenable assertion that it was Paul who brought Judaism into the Church, "through whose influence the Gospel, so far as this was possible, went to ruin" – a word that on account of its author has found far-reaching echo. Against this all newer specialised researchers – theologians, philologists and historians – judge otherwise, in that they unanimously emphasise the contrast of the Apostle to Judaism. Thus, for example, Dieterich in his *Mithras-Liturgy* demonstrates the absolutely un-Jewish in Paul's principal teaching of redemption through faith (p. 179): it is this ancient Aryan good, mediated by religious thoughts then widely diffused in the world of Hellenism; also Reitzenstein (likewise a philologist) shows in his *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions* one teaching of Paul after the other that they are not Jewish, and comes to the conclusion that the teaching of Paul is "the bearer of the strongest influence that Hellenism has ever exercised upon Christianity" (see especially pp. 160–204). William Ramsay – the refreshingly grasping geographer and theologian who dedicates his whole life to the investigation of the one great personality – instructs us: *Paul's deepest thoughts are abhorrent to Hebrew feeling* – the deepest thoughts of Paul are an abomination to Hebrew feeling (*Hist. Comment. on the Gal.*, p. 342); and the Jewish scholar C. Montefiore draws attention that the Pauline opposition of faith and works remains for the Jew eternally "a riddle," because he is altogether incapable of thinking anything thereby (*Judaism and St. Paul*, p. 77). Gardner – likewise a meritorious specialised researcher in this field – judges: "It was Paul who transplanted the becoming Christianity out of the narrow border-region of Judaism into the wide fields of Hellenistic culture" (*St. Paul*, p. 231). One consult also the extraordinarily instructive writing of Hans Böhlig, *The Spiritual Culture of Tarsus in the Augustan Age with Consideration of the Pauline Writings* (1913). Böhlig sets forth, for example, very clearly certain elementary differences that everywhere distinguish the world-picture of the Aryans from that of the Semitic peoples, and demonstrates that the Aryan conceptions "have passed over into the Apostle" – well in consequence of the Hellenistic surroundings of his youth – "so into flesh and blood that he applies them consciously and unconsciously uninterruptedly. A world-picture that brought such consequences with it Paul has not taken from Judaism." And in fact: "the world-picture of Paul is neither Semitic nor specifically Jewish"; rather it stems from the circle of ideas of the natural-philosophical school that then flourished in Tarsus under the direction of the famous Stoic Athenodorus. Through this city from of old Aryans streamed both eastward and westward, whereby it may explain itself that "ancient Aryan thoughts could remain living without being stifled by the encirclement of Semitism" (pp. 84–88). When in the further course of his work Böhlig then comes to speak of the religious fundamental thought of the opposition of law and faith, he remarks: "What is Jewish in this view? The terminology, the mode of proof, but never the total view. Such a negative judgment of the law must have been an abomination to every genuine Jew. At times it even makes the impression as if Paul, however incredible that sounds, had extraordinarily misrecognised Judaism as it was represented by the rabbis, or at least judged it quite one-sidedly" (p. 164). The earlier-named Montefiore asserts then also with all definiteness that Paul was in any case no rabbinical Jew; it is indeed to be assumed that he once for a time enjoyed instruction with a rabbi, yet by no means a regular and completed training (see especially pp. 58 ff., 66, 84, 103 ff., 227). Hereby he draws attention that the ever-repeated assertion that Paul was a pupil of the famous Gamaliel is only put into the Apostle's mouth by Luke (*Acts* 22, 3), whereas he himself in his letters never names the name, which must indeed give one pause.

To none of the named scholars does it occur to deny the Jewish in Paul's essence and thinking; this lies open to even the most superficial glance, and his letters bring examples enough of genuine rabbinical subtlety. In regard to the latter the English theologian Milligan – this be remarked in passing – draws attention to a delicious place (*Gal.* 3, 16), where from the promise "to Abraham and his seed" it is concluded that, because the word seed stands in the singular, not in the plural, this expression does not point to the entire posterity and thus also not to the whole Jewish people, rather to the single Christ alone, – upon which path Paul arrives at the desired conclusion (3, 29): "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise": hereby a high-point is certainly reached in the rabbinical art of turning the words and forcing them to testimony for an assertion lying aside! These, however, are the things that everyone can see, whereas only specialised scholars are authorised to pronounce a judgment upon language, linguistic style and also thought-style. Earlier one assumed, for example, generally that Paul writes a faulty, foreign Greek and held that for a result of his alleged Jerusalem education; one thought of the classics and did not know the written language of the Hellenistic epoch; now the things lie otherwise, and acknowledged authoritative researchers such as van Manen and Deissmann testify that Paul's language is genuine Greek. His style likewise proves itself, with more exact knowledge of the then literature – both in regard to the general shaping and also to the choice of expressions – far less influenced by the rabbinical dialectic than by the Stoic and Cynic "diatribe" (Heinrici, after *Bible Dictionary* III, 699) – a judgment with which Böhlig agrees, in that he sets forth: "Paul masters the Cynic-Stoic diatribe to such a degree in all his writings that one cannot think of a gradual influence by it upon his missionary journeys. Such a treatment of religious and ethical questions he has learned in Tarsus and not in Jerusalem. Rudolf Bultmann has led the proof (in his writing *The Style of the Pauline Preaching and the Cynic-Stoic Diatribe*, 1910) that almost all characteristics of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, as they had been customary since Bion of Borysthenes, have also been employed by Paul." Solely the scripture-interpretation – and even this more outwardly than inwardly – stems from the rabbinical school (pp. 154 ff.). Here also, as one sees, the Jewish is a surface-phenomenon, while Hellenistic education and manner of thinking lie at the base. Adolf Deissmann likewise judges in his book *Light from the East* (p. 290) that Paul as theologian is rabbinistically influenced, yet this is the least significant about him; as theologian he does not reach up to the great rabbis; as world-moving genius he belongs to the history of religion, and his religion is "wholly unrabbinical and wholly pre-dogmatic."

Correspondingly Paul's course of education is today judged essentially otherwise than earlier. Thus, for example, Reitzenstein asserts: "Paul must have read the Hellenistic literature; he speaks its language, he has entered into its thoughts" (*Hell. Myst. Rel.*, p. 59); Ramsay brings many examples of his acquaintance with Hellenic philosophy, and Merx calls Paul "a Greek-influenced universal spirit" (3, 203 ff.).

These expositions would work considerably more vividly if it were possible for me to enter into particulars; for that the learning and also the space fail me; nevertheless I will from Böhlig still hint at two examples: the sufficiently equipped reader may look up the thorough expositions on the spot (pp. 115–128 and 18 ff.).

The Hebrew language possesses no word for "conscience"; to the Jew this concept is therefore unknown. Paul on the contrary uses not only the word conscience (*syneidesis*) especially frequently, but grasps the concept so deeply that it belongs to the fundamental pillars of his moral teaching. The conscience "is for him the inward judge over the man's doing.... We can perceive at few concepts in the Pauline terminology so surprisingly how Paul first takes over certain expressions according to word and view, yet at the same time, by force of his religious genius, reshapes, deepens and makes them religiously valuable." Böhlig refers here to a special treatise by Steinmann from the year 1911, *The Conscience with Paul*, in which it is demonstrated: "The Apostle must have taken over this word from the treasure of his Greek education, for in the Old Testament no corresponding expression is found for it."

It is now the merit of Böhlig to have shown from fragments of the above-named Tarsian philosopher Athenodorus that this one was accustomed to emphasise the conscience (*syneidesis*) with greatest emphasis as "last moral axiom," and that – well from there – concept and word had also penetrated into the popular language. Here one grasps with the hands the origin of a conception which, deepened by Paul and as it were deified, was to gain mighty significance.

Not less significance attaches to the second example. Böhlig shows that from of old in Anatolia the inclination had existed to split the deity as it were into two: namely into an exalted, invisible, unreachable God and into a visible God who on occasion walks upon earth, – the first one called the "resting," the second the "working" God. In the known episode at Lystra (*Acts* 14, 11 ff.) this conception lies at the base, in that the people held Barnabas for the exalted and Paul for the working God. Böhlig writes: "The upper deity is represented as extra-worldly as possible. For itself alone it therefore does not become visible to the world. It needs a mediator who speaks and acts for it. Perhaps in the relation of these two deities to one another lies the root of the religious relation of Father and Son in the faith in God, as it also lies present in the New Testament. Everywhere the Father is thought as the exalted deity throning beyond the world, while the Son represents its active principle. Not only the work of redemption upon earth is his deed; as exalted he remains the active deity, he raises the dead, he holds judgment, he mediates all traffic between God and the world as long as there are men and an earth. Even the pre-existent already has this character: through him the world is created."

Thus one sees that Paul means it not figuratively but literally when, looking back upon his course of life, he confesses: "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise" (*Rom.* 1, 14).

In the above expositions I felt approximately as a wanderer who breaks for himself a narrow path through an immeasurable primeval forest as well as it will go, in that he once to the right, once to the left, as chance brings it, clears the obstacles out of the way: such a one may not boast that he has explored the forest, yet he may assert that he has gained a lively and correct conception of much that constitutes the essence of the forest. The goal stood clear before my eyes, yet the choice of the means was subject to a certain chance, in that memory recalled this and that to my mind, while much still more apt certainly escaped me or could not be looked up. Nevertheless I hope to have reached the purpose: the reader will henceforth be able to form some idea when he hears the assertion that Paul detached Christianity from Judaism. By no scholar known to me has this truth been worked out more sharply than by Renan: "*Entre les mains de Paul le Christianisme est arrivé à une rupture complète avec le Judaïsme*" (*S. Paul*, p. 470) – under the hands of Paul it has come to a complete rupture of Christianity with Judaism.

What was now effected by this rupture? The answer will surprise most: by this deed of the great Apostle the original Gospel was rescued from the inevitable ruin!

The process is so remarkable that one thinks one beholds the hand of Providence at work. There work with Paul from the beginning in enigmatic union a highest measure of conscious willing and an equal one of unconscious accomplishing. This wonderful man has – that one may assert with high probability – known no Gospel; his letters arose earlier and take at no single place reference to any report about the life of Jesus recognised as decisive. It is indeed permissible to conjecture that he possessed a small collection of genuine words of the Saviour – whether in writing or by oral tradition, no matter (cf. Souter:

Text and Canon of the N.T., p. 151); otherwise, however, the silence about the personality and the life of Jesus is characteristic for him, as he also confesses: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (*1 Cor.* 2, 2).

None the less it was precisely he who was called, through the success of his life-work, to draw the evangelical original reports into the light, so that therefrom the most precious possession of the whole of mankind arose.

In the meantime – first in Jerusalem and from the year 68 onward in the little town of Pella beyond the Jordan – the small circle of the personal disciples of Jesus, as also their adherents, had gathered together, and what they alone could testify of their Master gradually gained among them lasting shape. Notable researchers – e.g. Flinders Petrie in his *Growth of the Gospels* (1911) – are of the view that certain things – I name only the Sermon on the Mount – were already fixed in writing during the lifetime of the Saviour, and that the further traits gradually attached themselves around these core-parts, all without any conscious intention of creating a work. Only later was this material worked up into "Gospels." These unconscious creators, however, remained – even if according to race no Judaean Jews – yet pious members of the Jewish community and strict adherents of the Mosaic law (p. 148); in consequence their thoughts also remained narrowed by the Jewish horizon – for which, despite all later equalising elaborations, still enough… for which, despite all later equalising elaborations, still enough places in the Gospels bear witness, thus for example Matthew (10, 5 ff.), where the Saviour is said to command his apostles: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Such a direction was from the outset doomed to barrenness and had soon to die out: never could it succeed in convincing the real Jews that Jesus was the Messiah expected by them – that the history of two thousand years has in the meantime irrefutably demonstrated; only a small number of Jews of mixed race from the Diaspora may have joined those in Pella, thereto a few Hellenistic proselytes; this extremely trifling effect ran itself out so soon into the desert sand that the historians know little to report about it.

Meanwhile the fire-spirit from Tarsus – who in the course of his life came into only two-, at most threetimes fleeting contact with the named circle – meanwhile he wholly alone, out of his ownmost force – with the drawing-in of a staff of serving friends whom he himself trained up for this purpose – had founded in the whole region of the eastern Mediterranean basin a great number of "churches that were in Christ," and indeed not at remote spots, but in the most important harbour- and traffic-cities. As the most exact knower testifies: "Paul preached exclusively in the centres of trade and of Roman life; ... where Roman organisation and Greek thinking are at home, there Paul settles with preference" (Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 57). That circle of good Galileans in Pella consisted of country-dwellers and fishers; they knew nothing of the world, had experienced nothing, neither of its vices nor of the elevations of the soul which education, philosophy and art brought up; Paul on the contrary was from childhood a city-man, and indeed a greatest-city-man, and as such familiar with all the wickednesses into which men always quickly fall as soon as they – separated from natural conditions – live heaped upon one another:

In this wilderness of insolent city-life, In this chaos of refined crimes, In this morass of selfishness!

Yet his native city was at the same time a hearth of high spiritual striving; Strabo places Tarsus as place of education beside Athens and Alexandria (cf. Böhlig, p. 110); one enjoyed there the opportunity of becoming acquainted with all the noblest thoughts which Greeks had thought, and even to the unlearned people philosophical concepts and high religious conceptions were at least by name familiar.

As concerns the primordial presupposition of his Christianity, Paul shares with the personal disciples of the Saviour exactly the same conviction: Jesus is the Messiah (Christ) expected by the Jews, prophesied by the prophets, glorified in the revelation-writings; the same agreement also takes place in regard to most other fundamental assumptions. In that, however, Paul teaches: "Christ is the end of the law" and adds, "he brings everyone who believes to righteousness" (*Rom.* 10, 4), he annihilates Judaism, whose whole peculiar essence rests upon the assumption of a special law revealed only to it and which – as Moses Mendelssohn has remarked (p. 112) – without this law possesses no religion at all.

However strongly Paul may occasionally emphasize his Judaism: as soon as the law is abolished, the Yahveh of the Jews becomes the cosmological God of the world and of all men – "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (*Eph.* 4, 6 ff.); being a Jew loses all value, – "these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness" (*Rom.* 2, 14); the non-Jews therefore stand morally higher without the law than the Jews with it; and above all, the alleged Messiah of the Jews no longer brings these the expected world-dominion, rather he brings to all men "in whose hearts he dwells by faith" (*Eph.* 3, 17) redemption from the burden of sin and the torment of suffering and bestows upon them all eternal life: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love" (*Gal.* 5, 6). Hereby in contrast to Jewish Christianity a world-religion was founded.

If Paul removed himself in this manner from the earliest Christians, he removed himself still more from them through the reception of all kinds of thoughts and conceptions that did not stem from Judaism, but rather were diffused in the world of heathendom – then filled with religious longing: I name only redemption, rebirth, grace – fundamental pillars of his religious edifice; I could also add faith, insofar as Paul – in contrast to the historical-materialistic conception of the Jews – understands this word purely mystically-idealistically, which also the then mystery-religions generally strove after. In order not to be misunderstood, I must however immediately add that in this case the conceptions of his environment possessed for the Apostle only the significance of a preparatory school, a preparatory school to which the merit accrues of having made Paul ripe for the understanding of the teaching of

Jesus Christ concerning faith. Also his whole psychology – his distinction of body, soul and spirit, of earthly body and spiritual body etc., all conceptions that at that time possessed great significance for Paul and his hearers, stem one and all from his Hellenistic schooling; they strike us as foreign, for his contemporaries these very subtleties formed a welcome bridge to the grasping of the many new things that he brought them. To him, as to every genuine genius, there was given at the same time with the "desire for the impossible" the finest instinct for the possible, for that which the present just wills and can, for that after which it longs and which it is capable of reaching. Such men build for the centuries; none the less their work always bears at individual places the stamp of the time of its arising – I need only recall Plato; therefore such a work also always exhibits components which, according to our momentary standpoint, make the impression of compromises or of violences. A single exception history knows: Jesus of Nazareth stands outside all time-barriers, nothing in him grows obsolete, he is always of today: thereby his essence proves itself as a superhuman and extra-worldly one. One can very well understand that it became impossible for those who had experienced the presence of the Saviour, as also for the circle instructed by them, to make friends with Paul and his manner of teaching. When the Apostle to the Gentiles already stood at the height of his working, James and the elders compelled him to confess himself as an orthodox Jew, in that he takes upon himself in the temple at Jerusalem a strict vow and subjects himself to a special ritual purification (*Acts*, Chap. 21). Evidently from the beginning a rift exists: that man who before all others "must be recognised as the creator of the churches that are in Christ" does not belong to the disciples of Jesus and is by these only reluctantly – if at all – acknowledged. After the death of the great church-founder the community-elder still issues a pastoral letter for the refutation of the principal teaching of Paul and writes with intentional leaning upon his ownmost words: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (*James* 2, 24 and cf. *Rom.* 3, 28). The rupture had become a complete one; the Jewish Christians did not shy from calling Paul curtly "Satan."

Thus then two schools – or however one may otherwise designate them – stood over against one another like hostile siblings and were yet, as the sequel was soon to show, dependent upon one another: out of the union of both sprang the incomparable peculiarity as also the in religious values inexhaustible richness of Christianity. In that Paul spread his message of the arrival upon earth of the long-yearned mediator between man and God, of his redeeming death and rising again like a wildfire through the Roman Empire, he awakened in thousands of hearts the longing to experience more of this salvation-bringing heavenly man than just Paul was in a position to communicate to them; him filled the single striving to "paint before all eyes" the one hanging on the cross in such flaming colours (*Gal.* 3, 1) that no one could ever forget it again; before the Redeemer the Son of Man walking upon earth vanished from him, – of this there is with Paul not a single time the talk, except in the short description of the last supper and in the enumeration of the appearances of the Risen One; about the man himself, however, never a word, also no immediate reference to one of his divine utterances. One can take it as a proof of his genius that Paul, who had not experienced the Lord upon earth, recognised his incapacity to describe him and therefore was silent. Thus those in whose hearts the seed of faith had sprung up found themselves for the nearer knowledge of the personality of the Saviour directed to the small quiet band beyond the Jordan, among whom the life, the suffering and the teaching of Jesus had in the meantime gained the shape of a definite tradition. Immediately out of this tradition arose first the three first Gospels – each a little different from the two others in colour and tone, according to the peculiarity of the compiling author and especially according to the layers of population that this one had in view as readers; from the same source springs likewise the whole framework of the fourth Gospel, only a far more peculiar man stands before us, who in addition has been subjected to the revolutionising influence of the teachings of the Apostle to the Gentiles, so that his writing in certain relations forms a bridge between both worlds [Footnote: The Gospel of John is not thoroughly "Pauline," yet pronouncedly "post-Pauline" (cf. Gardner: *Cambridge Bibl. Essays*, p. 383). We come still at the close of the chapter to return to this.].

With right the early Christians regarded this fourfold report as a unitary work and were accustomed to speak in the singular of "the Gospel." No question, the Gospel forms the crown of the New Testament, forms it yet the most precious jewel of all literature; one may esteem the letters of Paul ever so highly, beside the Gospel they cannot be named. The value of the Gospel exceeds every estimation, for this work harbours the sole true tidings of the essence of the Divine – not speculations about it, but God lives therein, as he lives in the world, only for us men drawn into tangible nearness. And this most precious of all possessions would not have become our own if Paul had not awakened the longing for it in hearts ripe enough to understand or at least to divine what this tradition contained. Of Paul one may assert in the words of the poet:

To the sanctuary he built the shrine.

That he did this without knowing the sanctuary of our Gospels in no way diminishes his merit; for everything that he did happened out of fervent love to Jesus Christ and in the unshakable faith in his redeeming power. Nevertheless it belongs to the most wonderful traits in the destiny of the remarkable man that the most precious success of his working was attained without his knowledge and willing.

Let us now turn the glance to the Christ of the Apostle, in that we ask ourselves what he has in common with the Jesus as the Gospel revealed him to us (see Chap. 3), and what on the contrary distinguishes him from this one. Again it can only be a matter of general traits that become visible to everyone who looks with earnestness; whereas the theological that just here overgrows remains excluded from our consideration. Religion is an affair that concerns every man, and everyone will sooner or later discover that he is in the last rank directed upon himself if he wishes to gain within himself a relation to the Divine that furthers his life-forces.

A remark must be sent on ahead. Whoever – following the rationalists – doubts the reality of the vision at Damascus, thereby blocks for himself the way to understanding. Quite apart from the fact that a fundamental

liar would have been unsuitable and certainly incapable for the work that Paul accomplished upon earth, such an assumption testifies to a total ignorance of the soul-constitution of the then men; having of visions belonged to the general appearances of the religious life in general: us laymen should that at least be familiar from the *Golden Ass* of Apuleius, in which novel Isis appears to the much-tried hero in the dream and indicates to him the way of redemption, a process that repeats itself at every further focal point of his life. It is true Apuleius lived considerably later than Paul; yet he belonged to the same spiritual age. To the then men every kind of vision appeared so thoroughly credible that most among them knew them from their own experience, for here the expectation begets the appearance; it is true it was mostly a matter of dream-visions, yet one easily grasps in how far this disposition with especially fiery men had also to heighten itself up to day-visions: that happened with Paul. The psychological and physiological explanation does not affect us. What we can conclude with certainty is that in the breast of the rare man soul-rending inner conflict had preceded, partly under the threshold of consciousness, partly in the shape of tormenting thought-battles: these led to the decisive crisis, which one must in this case represent to oneself as a death-agony, out of which – through God's grace, so Paul felt it – new life, a life of rebirth, issued.

In the same connection the following deserves special attention. Just as the man – according to Goethe – sees only that which he knows, just so our experiences receive their special significance from the thoughts and conceptions that surround us from all sides and are therefore familiar. Now in the Hellenistic mystery-religions the proposition generally held that whoever had beheld God with eyes experiences upon himself a transfiguration that raises him above all ordinary men; thenceforward he is in a position to judge everything, while he himself can be judged by no one. "When a Paul experiences such a vision, that presupposes that he has already beforehand wholly lived in these views, and the manner of the narrative shows that also his community knows these views. And upon this vision he can found his claim to stand not under, but rather above the original apostles only if he himself just as his community is permeated by the Hellenistic valuation of this immediate beholding of God ... For him and his communities there must with the once-for-all beholding of God connect itself a lasting capacity to recognise everything out of himself, thus the possession of the Pneuma in the highest sense. Here a fixed sacral concept of the Pneumatikos holds sway, which at least I can derive only from the mysteryreligion": so writes Reitzenstein in his excellent work *The Hellenistic Mystery-Religions, their Fundamental Thoughts and Effects*, 1910 (pp. 47 ff., 58, 200 ff.) [Footnote: To the concept of the Pneuma corresponds with us approximately "spirit." Paul e.g. distinguishes Pneuma (spirit) from Psyche (soul) and from Sarx (flesh). The "pneumatic body" inherits the immortality, not the "sarkic body."].

One sees what decisive significance attaches to the event before Damascus and how foolish it would be to wish to pass over it with superior shrugging of the shoulders. Not merely the unshakable faith in his calling roots for Paul in this experience, rather it bestows upon us full enlightenment about his otherwise so strange behaviour toward the disciples of Jesus, whom from the moment of his conversion onward he avoids as far as possible. Certainly an unconscious aversion lies at the base here: his course of education, his temperament and his gift separated him from those men; still more the consciousness of the task to be performed separated him; yet the justification before himself he found solely in the vision that had been allotted to him, "which tremendous experience tore his religiously creative nature out of its previous boundness and set it essentially upon itself" (Reitzenstein, p. 50). About this we possess the Apostle's own testimony (*2 Cor.* 5, 16 ff.): "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." According to his own conviction, as one sees, every nearer communication about the essence and earthly course of the Saviour would only have been able to lead astray.

One may now lament this turn or not, one cannot possibly deny or depreciate the fact of the vision; for it forms without question the springboard to that mighty working out of which "the churches that are in Christ" issued.

Had Paul known Jesus upon earth, had he possessed nearer knowledge about his personality, he would most probably no longer have been suited for this work: the Saviour stood far removed from every founding of churches! and besides, how should he who had listened to his words find the courage to do anything other than to repeat them? Now, however, Jesus Christ stood for Paul at once wholly near and wholly far; he had experienced him and yet not experienced him; he had so to speak felt the breath of his breath and yet not looked him in the eye: out of this arose that manner of teaching peculiar to Paul which works so strongly and richly not least because it is full of immediately mutually contradictory elements that from the mid-point strive violently toward opposite ends, thereby shaking up and stimulating the hearer from all sides at once. Thus he lets, for example, Jesus be felt as humanly near to us men as "the firstborn among many brethren" (*Rom.* 8, 29) and then again he shifts him into immeasurable metaphysical world- and time-distances "as the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible ... And he is before all things, and by him all things consist" (*Col.* 1, 15 ff.). Or again he lets the totality of the believers melt with Christ into "one body" (*1 Cor.* 12, 12 ff.); none the less Christ is to come "to judge the quick and the dead" (*2 Tim.* 4, 1) ...

Nowadays – and it does not speak for great depth of religious feeling – almost everyone will interpose to me with the question: Did Paul hold Christ for God or not? About this question infinitely much has been disputed back and forth, but well only because a preconceived conviction was to be propped up at any price. In my opinion for every straightforwardly thinking man already the one fact must suffice that Paul repeatedly uses the expression that Jesus Christ sits "at the right hand of God" (see e.g. *Rom.* 8, 34, *Eph.* 1, 20, *Col.* 3, 1): in these words lies an unmistakable and never to be denied distinction; one note that not the trinitarian thought (which remained foreign to Paul) may be foisted upon him, for it does not say at the right hand of the Father, but at the right hand of God, and the expression is used in unmistakable leaning upon the revelation-books (apocalyptic), which never equate the Messiah with God.

There is a single utterance which can be so interpreted as if Paul asserted curtly: Christ is God. It is a matter of the fifth verse of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. The Apostle speaks at this place of the many advantages of the Israelites, "to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises" – now follows the fifth verse, which Luther germanises: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." Luther has here, as frequently, simply directed himself according to the Latin Vulgate, which offered the fundamentally false translation: *qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in saecula. Amen.* In reality the Greek original text does not say "who is over all God," rather "the God who is over all, be blessed etc." Hereby, however, the exact meaning of the sentence-part – the God etc. – is still not grammatically unambiguously firmly determined; it can be taken as apposition to the name Christ and accordingly refer to this one, according to which one would have to understand: "from the Israelites stems according to the flesh the Messiah (Christ) – the God who is over all, highly praised in eternity!" However forced this interpretation may sound, Augustine and many church-fathers, as also most churchmen even still today, take it as unquestionably correct and prefer to sacrifice the obvious connection of the whole place, as also the agreement of this place with all other utterances of Paul, rather than miss the sole opportunity of winning Paul for a principal church-dogma. That now the best among the oldest manuscripts make this interpretation impossible through their punctuation, upon that we will lay no all-too great weight, since arbitrariness or misunderstanding of the scribes could be assumed; the principal objection consists, however, in this, that the natural sense of the whole place lies clear before the eyes of every unprejudiced reader: to the Israelites is enumerated of what advantages they have become partakers from above, from the adoption as sons of God on to the gift of the Messiah born out of their midst; at the close follows, as customary with the Jews, the praise of God for so many testimonies of grace: this the quite simple state of affairs. One of the acknowledgedly most reliable specialised scholars of our time, Adolf Jülicher, judges:

"The taking-in of verse 5 b as apposition to 'the Messiah' is indeed linguistically unassailable and represented by old authorities; but Paul has never called Christ 'God,' still less 'the God exalted over all,' which quite indubitably designates the almighty world-creator" (see *The Writings of the N.T. newly translated and explained for the present*, edited by Joh. Weiß).

The least that one could expect would be the heeding of the warning that Erasmus pronounced four centuries ago: no honest man may appeal to so ambiguous a sentence and therefrom even derive decisive teachings. To the passionate Apostle, who was accustomed to spray forth his epistles volcanically out of over-full heart – "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you" (*Gal.* 4, 19) – to the passionate man it often happens that, driven by impatience, he does violence to the language, out of which darkness arises that can never – except through arbitrariness – be clarified; for that there succeed to him, as scarcely ever to another, sentences and whole sections incomparable in plastic force and in weight of expression, at the same time unmistakably unambiguous: it lies on the hand that these places are the ones in which one has to seek the views of the Apostle – not those; outside theology it would occur to no man to proceed otherwise

And so I then draw the reader's attention to a place which brings full enlightenment about that which *Romans* 9, 5 leaves in uncertainty. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. 8, V. 6, it is said: "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him" [Footnote: I give the place in Weizsäcker's rendering and remark immediately that the last words from "the mediator" onward bear the character of a clarification for present-day readers, whereas the Greek original text word-for-word translated runs: "One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him" (text and rendering after Tischendorf) – words that do not immediately unveil their sense to the unprepared reader, whose meaning however for the knower is not doubtful. Bousset germanises: "One Lord Jesus Christ, through whose mediation all things have become, and to whom we owe what we are." – Only out of conscientiousness do I add this note; for the principal part of the sentence – the clear distinction between God and Christ – offers neither indistinctness in the original text nor difficulty in the rendering.]. The reader may not interpret the words "one God, the Father" as if God-Father stood thought in opposition to God-Son: this Johannine thought never occurs with Paul and is also here excluded by wording and connection; has yet Paul just in the immediately preceding sentence distinguished between the concepts "God" and "Lord," in that he subordinates the "Lord" to the "God." Hereby there evidently floats before him the then usage of the Hellenistic mystery-religions, in which it was customary to address certain superhuman figures approaching near to the deity with *Kyrios*, i.e. "Lord"; thus e.g. one was accustomed to honour the mediators whom we came to know in the second chapter – Osiris, Heracles, Dionysus etc. – through the designation *Kyrios*: of this custom the Apostle makes use at the cited place and indeed in expressive sense, since he wishes precisely to emphasise the property of Christ as a mediator. Likewise the addition "the Father" to the word God serves to emphasise the character as most exalted unique being (see Chap. 1), whereby Paul at the same time joins himself to Jesus' own custom, who, as we know, always calls God "the Father." – A last clarification: Paul had just said of the heathen that they assume many gods and many lords; in contrast hereto – so he now emphasises – the Christians believe only in One God and in One mediator.

After these various clarifications I set the words of Paul once more here, certain that they will be distinctly grasped by everyone in their decisive weight: "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."

Now we are enabled to uncover the springing point in the question of the deity of Christ: for through the preceding discussions we have put ourselves in the position to overlook their elements from the viewpoint of Paul.

However strong influences his spiritual environment may have taken up mediately and immediately from the Hellenistic-Roman surroundings, the one thing could not be robbed from the one born and brought up as a Jew: his monotheism. Not the slightest indication that he ever wavered by a hair's breadth in this regard can be produced. From one of his last manifestations we already heard his confession of the faith in "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (*Eph.* 4, 6), and just now we heard the same in similar solemn words. Here now lies the solution of so many contradictions which at the first glance seem to stir up insoluble confusion: precisely in this and out of this unshakable monotheism, which would have rejected with indignation every appearance of a multiplication of the deity as a relapse into naked heathendom, precisely out of this massive, not for a moment wavering faith Paul draws the capacity to draw the mediator Jesus Christ gradually ever nearer to God, without having to fear that the boundary-line could ever be extinguished. Soon thereafter the believers found themselves pressed before a hard either-or; for Paul such a one never came into question, yes we can assert with definiteness that the possibility of such a posing of the question never entered his consciousness. It could seem as if this approximation of the Messiah to God on the part of the Apostle had experienced a gradual increase, yet with so mobile a spirit much depends upon the mood of the day and still more upon the train of thought just present. In a relatively early letter (*1 Cor.* 15, 47) Paul designates Jesus Christ as "man from heaven" or "man from heaven," and still in the considerably later arisen Epistle to the Romans it is said: "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (1, 4); the designation "Son of God" is already known to us as old Jewish title of honour (see p. 148), besides familiar from the daily speech-usage of the Saviour; here it comes to us upon the word "declared" (*horisthentos*), which can just as well be translated with "appointed," "promoted," "installed" (cf. the commentary of Sanday and Headlam). The exact sense of the whole sentence lets itself be unravelled only with difficulty; yet whichever interpretation may be given it, the one thing cannot be disputed: it is a matter of a temporal process, Christ is in a given moment elevated to "Son of God," which inexorably presupposes that this "heavenly man" earlier did not possess this dignity – in any case not in the literal sense. Then however again we meet places like the one already partially drawn upon from the Epistle to the Colossians (1, 15 ff.), which I here repeat more fully. Of Christ is the talk, and there it is said "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Also with this famous place, around which for centuries the struggle has raged, we will as far as possible beware of getting into the theological. Convinced that the Apostle, as a man of outstanding gift, who did not speak to scholars but turned to simple people with the intention of being understood by them, will in any case not have aimed at subtleties, rather that these all were first later read into it by the theologians, – convinced of this, we will with confidence presuppose that simple human understanding must suffice to understand that which such a man speaks to such men. I appeal to Paul himself, who speaks: "For we write none other things unto you, than what ye read or acknowledge" (2 Cor. 1, 13). For the present-day unprepared reader let it be sent on ahead that the expressions thrones, dominions, principalities, powers were all-known designations for various orders of angels and that the principal purpose of the whole sentence formed the putting-down of the abuse of the then raging belief in angels and the worship of angels, under which the conception of the religious significance of Jesus Christ ever more lost in liveliness; to avert this threatening danger, that was in general the aim of the letter. As one sees, the Apostle by no means contests the belief in angels, yet over against it he emphasises as exuberantly as only possible the pre-eminent significance of the Messiah, beside whom the angels appear trifling.

Of decisive importance is it to note the following fact: in this description of the Christ as arisen before all creation and as mediator of the whole creation – as it were as demiurge – not a single own new thought of Paul creeps in; down to the choice of the expressions, he simply appropriates everything out of the conceptions that then – diffused through the revelation-writings (apocalyptic) – circulated in widest layers of the people.

The heightening of the Messiah into the superhuman up to close to God, his pre-existence, his participation in the creation, his office as world-judge, his soon to be expected return upon earth – all that is found literally in the named books. Thereto comes still with Paul something out of the likewise at that time prevailing Stoic philosophy. The Apostle's own originality as founder of religion lies at another place: here he has simply played off the one popular conception against the other: the higher-standing, simplifying against the colourfully dispersing, leading down to mad superstition.

Yet we are not yet finished with the relevant place from the Epistle to the Colossians!

Of all those expositions which seem to assimilate Christ to the deity our theologians take possession with joy, thus also this one from the Epistle to the Colossians; if only this one did not offer a catch! Right at the beginning namely stand those fatal three words: "firstborn of every creature!" Hereby would Jesus Christ then once – and even if as first – have been "born," and accordingly also belonging to the "creation," created by God! And so since oldest times – especially however since the Arians had forged out of these three words their principal weapon against the doctrine of God of the Church – the attempts do not cease to convince the world that "firstborn" does not mean – or at least at this place does not mean – firstborn, and "of every creature" does not mean of every creature. At other places – thus e.g. "firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8, 29) – the same word "firstborn" (prototokos) is not contested its obvious sense, here however it may at no price be admitted. Just so it fares with the second and third word. The language-knowers assure that pases ktiseos means nothing other than "of every creation" or of everything made, created, at most (as Luther and Tischendorf germanise) of all creatures; yet here also the theologians raise protest: pases ktiseos may simply not mean "of every creation," for thereby would be expressly conceded that the ever so exalted Christ is a creature of God, not himself creator-God. All particulars the boldly disposed reader may look up in the specialised books; he will be able to study thereon for years. Only one example will I still name, in order to make the "theological disposition of mind" feelable to the layman. The thoroughly learned and thoroughly honest Bishop Lightfoot, who in his otherwise unsurpassable commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians heaps proofs upon proofs against the interpretation of those three words according to their simple sense as "firstborn of every creation," thinks to play out the highest trump through the remark: "It contradicts the fundamental idea of the Christian consciousness" – the assumption that the Apostle has written "firstborn of every creation" contradicts the fundamental conception of the Christian consciousness. Certainly a classic example for the power of rooted compulsory articles of faith: in order to experience what Paul has said, one first asks what the later arisen "Christian consciousness" demands, and according to that the Pauline text is then so long "interpreted" until it agrees with the decisions of the bishops' assemblies at Nicaea (325) and at Constantinople (381)!

We laymen, however, will refrain from all violence and out of this utterance as also out of others with certainty draw the conclusion that Paul has drawn Jesus Christ very near to God, without however ever letting him melt together with God – does he yet in this same Epistle to the Colossians, a few verses later than the discussed place, speak of Christ as "sitting on the right hand of God" (3, 1), thus as clearly distinguished from God. We are, however, authorised to go still further, yes, we first then meet upon the religious core of the Pauline thinking – upon a core inexhaustible in fruitfulness and in fullness of blessing. The true mid-point of the religion of Paul forms the clear conception and the forceful exposition of the significance and the dignity of Jesus Christ as the mediator between God and man: this thought is living, it springs from the mightiest life-experience and opens to millions the way to like experience; through it Paul became the creator of "the churches that are in Christ," and beside this thought many other conceptions of our Apostle sink down to mere traditional schemes.

The place where this thought reaches expression clear and distinct is found – that I must send on ahead – in a letter which by many scholars is denied to Paul, yet recently by outstanding specialised researchers is again with definiteness ascribed to him.

We read there: “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all” (1 Tim. 2, 5 ff.). If the letter should really have another as author, then this other was in any case a confidant of Paul – that is generally conceded – who with conscientiousness transmitted further the teachings of his master [Footnote: In order that the reader may form a picture of the present state of the disputed question, I name some names: the authorship of Paul is contested by Harnack, Holtzmann, Jülicher, Moffatt, and with especial passionateness Renan; against this the authenticity is defended by Zahn, B. Weiß, Lightfoot, Ramsay, Findlay.].

Besides there lies at bottom not all that much upon this one place, however welcome it also would be as concise summary; for – I repeat it – the conception of the significance and the dignity of Jesus Christ as a mediator permeates the whole thinking of the Apostle, lies at the base of all his principal teachings and accompanies them into their last ramifications.

To this consideration of the floating position of Jesus Christ between man and God – to which we moreover still return – there joins itself unconstrainedly a further one, whose kinship will soon be felt.

Characteristic for the manner of thinking and for the whole personality of our Apostle is it that he everywhere beholds, grasps and fathoms sharply opposed contrasts: his further thinking consists in the equalisation between these contrasts or in the overcoming of the one through the other – and everywhere this equalisation or overcoming takes place through Jesus Christ and in Jesus Christ. One could demonstrate a great number of such oppositions with Paul; science calls them antinomies, which – if we dissolve the word into its two constituents – is excellently germanised by counter-propositions. As examples I name: man and God, death and immortality, flesh (sarx) and spirit (pneuma), law and freedom, sin and justification, works and grace yet the attentive reader will be able to pursue the same manner of dissection still further, for everywhere it determines the Apostle’s thinking and presenting; if he finds, for example, occasion to mention poverty, he immediately sets over against it the riches (2 Cor. 8, 9), if there is talk of weakness, immediately he draws the force hither (2 Cor. 13, 4 ff.) – and it is Christ who transforms the poverty into riches and makes out of the weak a giant.

We heard Paul let the entire visible and invisible world of existence arise through the mediation of Jesus Christ, whereby Christ appears as mediator between the two great contrasts of the repose of God and the fullness of the creation. Not alone does he mediate the creation, but “in him” – thus again through his mediation – “all things consist” (Col. 1, 17), and not less does it aim toward him – for at another place (Eph. 1, 10) it is said that God has resolved “in the fullness of times to gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth.”

By the way I would immediately beg my reader not to rack his brain over the logical-historical sense of such a statement: it is yet a matter of a myth, and that means of a formation of the fantasy, invented in order to break for unthinkable and therefore unspeakable truths presentiment-filled approximation to our mind a path. To this question of the mythical with Paul we soon return; for the present we must still linger a little with his counter-propositions.

The principal contrast – that one which encompasses everything that belongs to Paul’s proper religion and under which most other counter-propositions can be ranked as partial appearances – is that between man and God: one of those that does not find its settlement through overcoming of the one part at the cost of the other, rather through strongest affirmation of both parts: in that the man – instructed and enabled thereto by Jesus Christ – raises his purified essence Godward, while the deity – the Father – determined thereto through the intercession of Jesus Christ – sinks itself graciously down to the man.

In order to grasp the significance of this thought rightly, one must know and consider that the man, in that he joins himself to Christ, gains capacities through which he becomes a new essence and receives new dignity: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5, 17). Out of this arises a new relation of the man to God; "he is the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in him"; therefore the earliest Christians called themselves the community of the saints: "for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (1 Cor. 3, 17).

It is a matter not alone of feeling-values and of moral elevation, but – as Paul demonstrates – also of a heightening of the capacities of understanding, in that we "have the mind of Christ": even if "the deep things of God" remain unfathomed, we receive through Christ "the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God" (1 Cor. 2, 12–16).

The conception of the heightening of the whole human essence as the principal work of Jesus Christ supplies in this train of thought the decisive trait. The previous ideal or prototype (original image) of that essence that can be called man was the Adam of the creation-narrative; with Christ a new thoughtshape "man" steps into appearance; wherefore Paul calls him the "second Adam": the first ideal man was "living soul," the second is "life-giving spirit": "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15, 45–49). Out of this presentation two things emerge unmistakably: first the also for us reachable heightening of our human essence in the direction that the Saviour has pointed, and second the fact that he effected this as man. It namely strikes one that at such decisive places Jesus Christ is by the Apostle always expressly designated as "man," i.e. thus his manhood is emphasised. Thus e.g. we read in the all-known expositions of the Epistle to the Romans (5, 12–21), in which again Christ as second Adam is set over against the first (both expressly designated as "prototypes"): ". if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." [Footnote: Here I have used the germanisation of Adolf Jülicher, because it seemed to me to give the most graspable sense in German. This in the original script extremely complicated sentence is translated by every scholar differently; yet about the general sense there exists no doubt, especially not about the words "of the one man Jesus Christ."] Also I refer once more to the sentence in the Epistle to Timothy (p. 201): "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." The conception of the possibility of the heightening of the man out of an indeed "soul-endowed" yet animal essence to a "spirit-endowed" God-related essence demands thoroughly that Jesus Christ has been man, otherwise his example loses every significance for us. The Apostle now lies everything upon convincing of this capacity for heightening; for this faith forms his whole religion – as it equally constitutes the secret of the enormous force-effect that he has exercised upon mankind; even if precisely this principal teaching mostly – as such – remained unrecognised, it nevertheless worked with irresistible power.

Many a difficulty arises out of the half-hidden remaining contrast between present and future, between present redemption and future redemption.

Far from the mark would be the assumption that Paul has solely a future life in mind; it is true he grasps the earthly existence only as forecourt to the beyond: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5, 1); yet the beginning must be made here upon earth, here and today: that is commandment – otherwise we inherit not the immortality. Possible is it, thanks to the life, the teaching and the dying and the rising of our Saviour: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3, 11).

Paul is so thoroughly permeated by the certainty that the mediator who has dwelt among us "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8, 3) is – as soon as we only believe on him, and that means credit him this power – capable of effecting a perfect inner transformation also in us, that he boldly writes: "when we were in the flesh" (Rom. 7, 5) – whereby he distinctly declares that the Christ-believing man has already now exchanged the "flesh-shape" for the "spirit-shape" which is proper to the new mankind. Such assurances we meet not seldom with Paul. I recall e.g. the following: "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death."

"Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness" (Rom. 6, 2, 4, 18). "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3, 3) Finally I call the decisive word into memory: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3, 26). One must not imagine that the Apostle gives himself over to the delusion that the members of his churches have as a consequence of their conversion and baptism ceased to sin. Dozens of places one could adduce for proof of the contrary; ever again he admonishes: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin" (Rom. 6, 13) – and similar. None the less Paul holds fast that we – as soon as we belong to Jesus Christ – already here upon earth "walk in newness of life." Religion is namely for him – as it was for Jesus – immediate, pulsating, flaming present. Nothing is more erroneous than the assertion of some theologians that the religion of Paul is – in contrast to that of the Saviour – a religion of the future, built upon hopes; rather according to Paul there is no future at all for those men who do not here and today confess themselves to Christ. Faith is for him the most active of all deeds; through faith the man begins to become creator, and indeed first upon himself – because namely faith means nothing other than to open our soul to the deity and thereby to give it entrance.

About the apparent contradiction that we have just uncovered with the Apostle – insofar as he still praised sinful men as holy temples of God – about this apparent contradiction our glorious Schiller enlightens us, in that he instructs us: "The pure moral impulse is directed upon the unconditional, for it there is no time, and the future becomes for it present as soon as it must necessarily develop itself out of the present. Before a reason without barriers the direction is at the same time the completion, and the way is traversed as soon as it is struck" (Aesth. Erz., Letter 9). This immortal word of Schiller's is as if coined upon Paul, whose life consisted of pure consuming present – a restlessly future-creating present: "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark!" (Phil. 3, 13).

All that are only concise hints; the subject is inexhaustible; it must suffice me if I succeed in stimulating to right thoughts; I presuppose readers for whom it is a need to research further and to think further. Linking on to the earlier posed question: did Paul hold Christ for God or not? (p. 194) I will now draw the said readers' attention to a circumstance suited to work enlighteningly in various directions.

That Jesus had lived among us men as man, that stood not in question. One note now that there are two kinds of ascribing to a man essential equality with the deity: the one subsequently transfers that man into heaven and declares, "he has become God," the other asserts, "God had taken human shape in him and had walked among us": in the first case it is a matter of a myth, in the second of a mystical cognition. One does well to note this distinction and to keep it in mind, because both – myth and mysticism – are feelers that we men stretch out of our limitedness into the surrounding world of the spiritual gropingly, yet each very different from the other. The myth transfers the near into the far, the known into the unknown, in the hope upon this path to gain for the incomprehensible an intuitive conception; against this the mysticism draws the invisible far into the innermost mind, in order that it may there immediately work. To us Europeans the mythical world-view is mainly familiar out of the classical world of Hellas and Rome; for the mysticism of the God walking upon earth the Aryan India offers us the best-known examples.

The advantage of the myth lies in the general intelligibility of a visibly shaped, the disadvantage consists in the danger that the image displace the secret and become the thing itself; to the mysticism is proper an incomparable force of immediacy, against this it remains hard to communicate to others the experiences awakened by it, and therefore it is accustomed – with further diffusion – to lead to senseless word-rubbish and to hypocrisy: there thus materialism threatens, here formalism.

Paul now, as envoy of the new glad tidings, has of these two means of letting others take part in his religious experience made abundant use: a sample of his mythical teaching we have above (p. 200 ff.) considered exhaustively and seen that he beholds Jesus of Nazareth as mediator of the entire worldcreation – in its beginning, its continuance and its goal. Such utterances fall into the eyes, and yet there lies for the Apostle incomparably more upon the mystical cognition that to the man Jesus "all the fullness of the Godhead" dwelt, that he was "the image of the invisible God," whose "glory shone upon his countenance" – in short, that in the person of this man a Divine has walked among us.

Introductorily, let a peculiarity of Paul be pointed to that is characteristic for him alone: never does he go – neither with his myth nor with his mysticism – to the logically demanded end, always he stops short before it. At that time e.g. only the Jews were horrified at the assertion that a man is God, to Greeks and Romans this conception was familiar – was yet every emperor immediately after his accession to the throne revered as deity; nevertheless Paul has never – we experienced it above – roundly declared: Jesus Christ is God; just as little has he ever – as soon after him John did – spoken the word: God is become flesh (i.e. man) in Christ. From this we gather in what purity this wonderful man grasped the conception of the mediator as foundation of all religion. Therefore with him also everything is so incomparably rich in life and in living force of effect, because namely – as is the case with every life-shape – the whole organism of his thinking floats exactly upon the knife's edge, out of which greatest mobility with always newly adjusting equilibrium-relations results, and all otherwise everywhere soon appearing stiffening and getting stuck remains excluded. When the Apostle's thoughts dwell under the sin-burdened mankind and look from there upward, he beholds the Saviour upon God's throne; when he on the contrary attempts to unravel God's world-plans, then Christ becomes for him the type of the new man, the "second Adam."

Never should one apply to Paul the measure of a systematiser and dogmatist: with him is – subjectively considered – everything immediate, mystical experience, and – objectively seen – passionate willingto-convince, which in the choice of the means for persuasion always directs itself according to the views and thought-habits of those to be converted.

The great significance of the latter remark for the judgment of the individual letters of Paul lies on the hand. Thus he directs e.g. that letter with the creation-myth to the Colossians, Asia-Minor people, in whose heads such delusion-thoughts from of old circulated; it suffices him if he for the present can force back their mad angel- and demon-superstition into bounds and win for Jesus Christ the first place. A second example: if he writes to the Corinthians – Greeks brought up in polytheism – he concedes to these without further ado: "there be gods many" and demands of them only in addition the faith in the One God who is over all, the Father, and in his mediator Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 8, 5 ff.). He himself confesses it: "For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews ...; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you" (1 Cor. 9, 19–23).

How foolish, with a man who freely lays down such a confession, to forge out of individual utterances binding articles of faith (dogmas) and to lay every word upon the gold-balance! Rather we have to recognise that in their mythical components the teachings of Paul thoroughly possess only the value of allegories, images, approximations, hints, whereby still the Apostle gladly takes into consideration the conceptions of his respective hearers in order from the side familiar to them to undertake the approximation to hidden truths.

Following the same guiding-thread we can still gain further stimulations suited to deepen and to sharpen our understanding of the letters of Paul. Thus we will e.g. with most of the fundamental counter-propositions that we found characteristic for the Apostle's thinking, upon more exact consideration discover that the one side of the equation – i.e. the one "proposition" – belongs more to his mythical, the other – thus the other "proposition" – more to his mystical thinking; the mythical propositions possess evidently rather figurative significance and are not to be understood all-too literally, whereas with the mystical propositions the words wrestle to bring the innermost heartthoughts of the writer to expression.

One consider the for the religion of Paul decisive contrast "works: faith." The teaching of the redemption through God-commanded works is first always historically presented and that means – as Kant instructs us – unreligious, second, who can read the Epistle to the Romans without remarking that the Apostle in regard to the justification through commanded works is intent upon building up a complicated myth, in which he sometimes knows neither in nor out, until he makes himself air through a new violent turn? To set this forth exhaustively here would lead too far; I recommend, however, an attentive immersion in the chapters 5–8. And then one consider the series of the related counterpropositions – I name merit and grace, law and freedom, sin and justification, judgment and redemption! Everywhere one will find that the first member of these oppositions is treated as myth, the second on the contrary as mystical secret. Of the law holds exactly the same that was said of the works; the sin is downright personified into a mythical essence:

"Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. 7, 20); the juridical conception of the judgment is without further ado borrowed from the Egyptian myth and reaches through the mediation of the Jewish apocalyptic into Paul's hands, – it forms an immediate contradiction to the teaching of the redemption through Jesus Christ, one only recall the words directed to a criminal: "To day shalt thou be with me in paradise." In what another world we move as soon as the Apostle speaks of faith, grace, freedom, redemption. One imagines one hears another man speak.

For the significance of the concept faith – I would rather say, for the significance of the fact of faith – with Paul it is not possible to refer to a single utterance that somehow exhaustively set forth content and sense: the faith forms the driving-force of his whole life; this breaks forth everywhere and exceeds as super-earthly experience all capacity of the human language. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2, 20). One must by no means overlook the words "who loved me"; for with Paul faith and love hang closely together. We heard it indeed earlier: only that faith is genuine and "availeth any thing" which "worketh by love," for – as it soon thereafter is said – "it is a new creation," and creative is solely the love (Gal. 5, 6; 6, 15). Thereto the great researcher Bengel remarks: "upon these words rests the whole essence of Christianity" (after Lightfoot). "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness" (Rom. 10, 10), it is said at another place: it is thus a matter of no holding-for-true, just as little of a being-convinced through reasons of reason, but of an experience in the innermost mind that seizes the whole essence of the man [Footnote: Hereby the Catholic teaching finds itself from the outset refuted: "ex toto ecclesiae dogmate quod intellectu capi potest, capiant, quod non potest, credant" (Vincentius Lerinensis, after Loofs: Dogm. Gesch., 437). This sober teaching has not the least to do with Paul's teaching of faith.].

One hear still the following words:

"I bow my knees unto the Father , that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge" (Eph. 3, 16 ff.). Only who is "rooted and grounded in love," only he alone knows what that means, in the sense of the Apostle Paul: to believe on Christ. "And though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing!"

At these last words I ask myself whether every reader knows what the state of affairs is with that highpoint of Pauline inspiration that under the name thirteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians is familiar to everyone? Here by the Apostle before our eyes the essence of the faith is unfolded, perhaps I say better, folded asunder: thereby hope and love appear as constituents of the faith. Of the love as the faith's innermost heart we have just heard. The hope forms as it were its outer garment, the armour-ornament, and belongs to those "armour of light" that the Apostle recommends us to put on (Rom. 13, 12); within the mystical faith-life the hope represents a mythical element and drives to action; we are to "against hope believe in hope" (Rom. 4, 18), "for we are saved by hope" (Rom. 8, 24).

Thus these various elements work into one another and form together that which Paul understands under faith.

Yet the indispensable complement still fails us, without which the faith would not be faith.

To the faith belongs inseparably the grace: the one cannot exist without the other. First we feel the grace as a consequence of the faith, yet Paul instructs us: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God " (Eph. 2, 8). Here lies indisputably the greatest secret – the proper mystery – of the Pauline and with it of all genuine religion. It is true Kant judges: "If everything runs out upon an unconditional decree of God – 'he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth' (Rom. 9, 18) –, then this means, taken according to the letter, the salto mortale of the human reason" (Religion, p. 178); whereupon is to be replied that of the "letter" here there can be no talk, since it is a matter of things that far exceed all human reason, however convincingly they are also experienced. Beth demonstrates that the conception of a highest God voluntarily inclining himself helpingly to the man – related in essence to our conception of grace – is also not unknown to the most primitive peoples (Religion and Magic among the Nature-Peoples, p. 209); be that as it may, in the world of the Greeks and of the Greek-mixed ones at the lifetime of Paul conception and word "grace" (charis) were all-diffused and occupied the thoughts of the religiously directed; the questions of predestination and those of the calling or of the election of grace were much discussed in the then mystery-religions (Reitzenstein, Myst. relig., p. 37 ff.). Ramsay writes: "The epitome of that tender product that we call Hellenism lies enclosed in the conception Charis. The spirit of Hellenism blows upon us out of this word. Without Charis, no Hellenism" (Teaching of Paul, p. 404 ff.). Very characteristic for Paul as converter-genius I find it that he precisely this word – which already in the ears of his hearers resounded full of secret magic – chose for the communication of his deepest mystical presentiment.

Since I say "his presentiment," I must immediately add that he owed this presentiment to the Saviour himself: here immediate contact takes place – explain this to oneself through the revelation allotted to Paul, or simply through his manifoldly attested exact knowledge of the most important utterances of Jesus Christ; and hereby he was enabled to breathe new life into the familiar word "grace." What Jesus has taught in this regard stands beyond doubt, do yet the earlier evangelists report the word: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered" (Matt. 10, 29 ff.) – and John brings words like the following: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him. no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my

Father”
(6, 44, 65). To us men it mostly falls hard to assent to this conception of the unconditional omnipotence of God, always we wish at least to assume some restrictions, without which freedom and with it morality appears to us endangered. Jesus and Paul knew it otherwise. Paul gives as decisive example the case of Jacob and his brother Esau, – children of the same pair of parents – whose both fates were beforehand proclaimed, “before they were born, neither having done any good or evil, – that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,” whereto the Apostle adds: “So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy” (Rom. 9, 11, 16).

Our human reason is namely here thoroughly insufficiently equipped; with that we have to put up. Has yet Kant shown that also within this reason the conflict between freedom and necessity can only be settled through a decree of power that ascribes to both assertions equal and simultaneous right to existence, in that, according to the standpoint of the consideration, the one time all actions of men must be assumed as gaplessly conditioned, and that means as necessary, the other time the same actions are recognised as issuing out of free resolve. We must, I think, for the region outside the reason help ourselves similarly, in that we concede to two apparently contradictory assertions equal content of truth: the omnipotence of God and the free choice of the man. Paul says the Christians are “called unto liberty,” yes even: “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free” (Gal. 5, 1 and 13), whereby he again literally exactly agrees with Jesus, who spoke: “And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (John 8, 32). At the base lies the thought that first that man who acknowledges God’s unconditional omnipotence and knows himself as the creature of his grace possesses real freedom: “If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed,” whereas “Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin” (John 8, 34 ff.). As one sees, Jesus and Paul understand under freedom not a logically determinable concept, but a mystical experience.

Also the conceptions of the justification and of the redemption are solely to be understood mystically. I will beware of following the theologians in their extensive discussions about these two concepts; the more they say, the less one understands them; I for my part gladly content myself with Paul. There where he speaks of the justification, he confesses: “For whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober, it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us” ... (2 Cor. 5, 13). And, if he repeatedly speaks of the Last Judgment, even of “the wrath of God” (Rom. 3, 5), – everything in connection with the old-Egyptian conceptions of a juridical procedure, whereby the Saviour’s promise of the redemption to all sinners (cf. Chap. 3) would be abolished – yet he names at another place Jesus “him that justifieth the ungodly” (Rom. 4, 5), and says of God: “It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?” (Rom. 8, 34). Not less remains the conception of the redemption a purely mystical one, never to be clearly grasped by the mere reason; as soon as the reason seeks to bring it into a focal point, it dissolves. Also the assertion that the death on the cross has brought us the redemption expresses only a figurative partial truth, for, as Paul says, “of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1, 30): not his death alone – this conception leads to crass materialism – rather his appearance upon earth in general is it that “redeems” us men out of the bonds of animality.

With an English theologian I find a list of nine different statements of Paul about the significance and the value of Christ’s death; according to mood and intention the conception changes. Well as the most comprehensive and deepest may we designate that one according to which this death in representation of all men has overcome the death and first bestowed life upon the life: “For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again” (2 Cor. 5, 14 ff.).

Important is it to know that the – connecting on to Old-Testament manner of thinking – widely diffused conception of a sacrificial death demanded by God for atonement finds with Paul no support. Since about this so much error prevails and is cultivated by our churches, I call some of our acknowledged best specialised researchers as witnesses. Ramsay teaches: "The idea that the Pauline teaching ascribes to the working of Christ the significance of a sacrifice offered to God takes images and symbols wordfor-word and must be designated as deep error" (Teaching of Paul, p. 198). Kaftan, in his known book Jesus and Paul (p. 38), testifies: "Paul has nowhere expressed the thought that the death of the Christ is a satisfaction rendered to the divine wrath or the divine justice. What he really says excludes this thought directly. He knows only the love as the motive out of which God has given his Son. Of a condition that would have to be previously fulfilled before he could forgive, he (Paul) knows nothing. The whole theory (of the satisfaction) is foreign to his consciousness." Still I appeal to Otto Pfleiderer, who writes: "The ecclesiastically established teaching of the justification of the sinner for the sake of the merit imputed to him, or for the sake of the alien righteousness of Christ, must accordingly be designated as a distortion and flattening, just as well of the reformatory as of the Pauline teaching. Only under preservation of the full mystical-ethical depth of the Pauline concept of faith will also the Pauline teaching of justification be rightly understood " (Der Paulinismus, 2nd ed., p. 185).

Paul himself is accustomed, where he touches these last questions, not seldom to add warning words to the expositions in which he seeks to communicate mystical truths to the mind; e.g.: "I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh" (Rom. 6, 19) or: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part," and: "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face" (1 Cor. 13, 9 and 12).

Nothing deserves more admiration than the magnificent unprejudicedness with which Paul sets side by side the often – as we have seen – immediately mutually contradictory sentences of his myth and of his mysticism: thereby he proves himself (to borrow Goethe's word about Aristotle) as "architectonic man." For he needed both: of the myth, in order to become "creator of the churches that are in Christ," and of the mysticism, in order to infuse into these churches a – it is true often enough remaining hidden under the myth – religious content.

Here I draw the line and pass over to the last section of the chapter, although I still have to point to an all-most-important in regard to myth and mysticism with Paul; I believe, however, the relevant discussion will work more impressively from the new standpoint. The principal question namely, which the purpose and goal of this book causes us to pose in this chapter, runs: In how far can we regard Paul as genuine interpreter of the expressed and of the unexpressed thoughts of Jesus Christ? In how far can we rely upon it that he really leads us to Jesus and does not perhaps remove us from him?

According to our results gained up to now it would be tempting to set up the simple sentence: in his mysticism Paul proves himself as genuine disciple of Jesus; against this the various mythical components of his thought-edifice stand wholly outside of that which we know of the Saviour's religious teaching and world-view.

According to the evangelical reports (including the Johannine) the Saviour has indeed used many parables, yet avoided every myth; the very little that one might at most reckon thereto is partly suspicious in regard to its authenticity, partly it is evidently a matter of allegories that for the sake of easier understanding link on to popular conceptions. One could indeed take the two always recurring conceptions of the "Father" and of his "kingdom" as a conceivably simplified myth reduced to purely human elements; for the frequency and the impressiveness of the repetition of these two conceptions lends them a certain degree of reality that, taken literally, does not belong to them.

Already in the third chapter I drew attention to what this image of the "Father" is to mediate (p. 117 ff.); yet one must beware of overloading the carrying-capacity of such an image: if e.g. a real father lets love, care, forbearance fall to his children's share, he thereby only does his duty – whereas God, in that he shows us men the same, thereby exercises grace. The difference is a mighty one, and whoever here wished to elevate the comparison speaking to the heart to a symbolic myth with content of reality would precisely destroy the principal teaching of Jesus. No! Jesus, the mediator, the second Adam, the "heavenly man" lives and weaves so wholly already in the other world that this our world offers him nothing more that would suffice for his purpose of communication, and were it ever so mightily poetically worked; everything of the kind could divert and disperse; therefore he chooses only some most general nature-relations and sets them in their naked simplicity as images for the unsayable. This is it that lends his speech an immediacy without equal: with almost every sentence he steps over out of the this-side into the beyond – and indeed effortlessly, as if it could not be otherwise. Thus has never a man spoken, and when we have listened to him, we feel painfully with every other the laboriousness and at the same time the insufficiency.

For the inventing of myths, if beauty and easily fitting appropriateness are to be proper to them, a special and rare gift belongs: the peoples of predominantly Aryan stock possessed it in high degree; to the Semites – above all to the Jews – little of this gift had been allotted. The Jewish apocalyptic literature possesses in every direction extremely slight value: literarily it stands very low, artistically it is null, morally not unobjectionable. And – as we have already seen – this literature forms, together with some other scarcely less turbid sources, the principal source for the Apostle's mythical thinking!

We may assert with all definiteness: whatever one may think about this – by our churches over all measure esteemed – part of the apostolic edifice, in any case in this regard no connection, yes not even a contact exists between the Saviour and his Apostle.

Here, however, is the place to call for that earlier named all-most-important consideration.

Jesus stood alone upon lonely height, outside all time, all history, all world-arising and -passing; he needed to found and to prove nothing; the truth that he proclaimed stood and stands from ever to ever. Paul on the contrary received the office to mediate Jesus himself – the mediator; he had to convince the men of Jesus' unique significance as mediator between man and God; so this only succeeded to him, were to him – as we heard him earlier confess – all means welcome, – must yet surely every way that led to Jesus be a blessed one.

If we have to regard Jesus himself as outside all history, and if nothing was more characteristic for his teachings than their disregard of the concept of time (p. 102), so none the less his earthly existence forms the most important of all events for the moral history of mankind: that we today easily see; at Paul's times, however, still no man knew anything of it, and it would have been purely impossible to awaken and to fetter the attention of wider layers of the people through the simple presentation of the as it were outside all time accomplishing itself earthly walk and of the in high measure from human conditionings loosened teaching of Jesus; the incomparable would have remained unrecognised. Therefore it was indispensable to rank the divine shape into the world-history. The disciples themselves had had to grasp at the conception of the Messiah expected by the Jews in order to explain to themselves the immediately experienced impression and to justify it. Paul found himself as Jew, who also had to justify himself before Jews, directed upon the same conviction; only he built it further out, in that he emphasised the apocalyptic interpretation of the Messiah far more strongly than the evangelists and went still beyond these. The sole concept of a Messiah of the Jews would, however, have made little impression upon Hellenes, Romans and oriental mixed peoples – were yet the Jews generally despised; so Paul then turned all force upon the elevation of this Messiah-conception to a no longer national, but cosmic one.

Hereby the to him familiar Greek gnosis (secret world-science) offered him the conception of a whole ladder of intermediate beings, between God and the world – intermediate beings of whom he frequently makes mention as of lords, dominions, powers, spirit-beings etc. – and at whose summit he now placed Jesus Christ. Precisely with such traits that strike a present-day unprejudiced man as monstrous, he hit upon conceptions that were familiar to his hearers and insofar welcome; not as if clever calculation had determined him, rather his genial instinct in league with the compelling will led him with unfailing certainty to lead the men to Christ.

To the non-Jews, however, Paul went still further toward; for he borrowed from them not alone so many essential traits of his myth, but besides still the outer framework for his inner religion – that which one could call the myth of his mysticism. It may now be regarded as finally demonstrated that Paul was familiar with the Hellenistic mystery-religions surrounding him from early youth: for proof the great number of peculiar words alone would already suffice, which occur in his letters and which earlier made trouble for language-researchers and theologians, of which however now it stands firm that they one and all were well-known technical expressions out of the common speech-treasure of the various mystery-religions. Without entering into particulars and in that I for these refer to the above already often cited works of Reitzenstein and others, I content myself with naming the four fundamental pillars of the inner religion of Paul – faith, grace, rebirth, redemption: all four are as concepts and as words taken from those religions. One understands now what caused the Abbé Loisy to the in its brevity over-bold assertion: “If Paul succeeds in making himself heard with the heathen, he owes it to the circumstance that he presents the salvation that he preaches to them after the manner of the heathen” (Revue d’histoire et de littérature religieuse, Vol. 3, 1912, p. 573). In these words lies truth, if only it is not overlooked that the Apostle to the Gentiles breathed new life into these already existing ancient Aryan concepts and thereby out of the old yet created a new. This new he owed to Jesus Christ alone: for now all at once in place of pale presentiments and hopes stood the fact of the earthly life, of the death and of the rising again of Jesus of Nazareth, the mediator between man and God.

With never-tiring tension-force Paul cries this fact out into the world and convinces the men thereby that he knows how to insert this new fact into conceptions that are already familiar to them. To this genial working we owe not alone “the churches that are in Christ,” but – what has more to signify – to him we owe in the last end the heavenly treasure: the Gospels! That the reader will now understand better than in the earlier section of this chapter. Had Paul himself been the Saviour’s disciple, he would not have been suited for the office of the Apostle to the Gentiles; Providence has averted this danger and thereby bestowed upon him the necessary outer distance, in league with the unappeasable inner longing. The immediate nearness of Jesus of Nazareth would with a man of so passionate receptivity have made every thought of apocalyptic and of mystery-myths for ever impossible; so on the contrary Jesus Christ became for him as it were a Platonic idea, a thought-shape, which offered the great advantage of directing the eyes of the men in the first rank upward into the height and of convincing their hearts of the uniqueness and of the world-significance of the appearance: “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself” (2 Cor. 5, 19). In this manner Paul, as already remarked above, awakened the longing after the mysteriously arisen, hiddenly lying masterwork that then through various hands was rescued from the ruin; and soon Luke could report: “Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word” (1, 1 ff.). The said holds of the three first Gospels; with the fourth Gospel, however, Paul stands in still closer relation: all theologians agree in the judgment that the Gospel of John is unthinkable without Paul.

Just as much therein refers itself to the three preceding Gospels, be it in order to supplement them or to correct them, just so the whole thought-web of the unique work stands everywhere in relation to Paul's working and teachings, in that this one – to apply his own word – has served John as "forerunner." E.F. Scott, a specialised researcher in this field, judges: "The Fourth Gospel is built upon the foundations that Paul had laid" (Fourth Gospel, p. 51). None the less John diverges in essential points so strongly from Paul that his expositions gain the value of fundamental corrections – precious corrections that rest upon the exact knowledge of the Saviour's own teachings. I will name only two: the conception of the sin and that of the death. In the chapter about the Saviour we were made attentive to the slight emphasis of the sin on the part of Jesus; in contrast hereto one may assert that in the religion of Paul – as also, following him, in the religion of all our churches – the sin forms the pivot of the whole teaching. John on the contrary returns to the pure teaching of Jesus, according to which it comes upon the transformation of the man out of a low into a higher-standing essence, with which transformation everything that we men call "sin" slides down from our shoulders. Just so with Paul a special significance attaches to the death – with the man as the wages of sin, with Jesus as act of reconciliation, whereas John, instructed by his master, regards the body-death simply as an appearance of the body-life and always under the words "life" and "death" understands the beingwith-God and the being-without-God: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (John 5, 24). In short, religion is for John as for Jesus not history, but present.

The great in Paul, the decisive, the world-moving forms the manner how he gathers up out of all spiritual regions what only is suited to impress the human mind, and brings each into relation to the person of Jesus Christ, as it were gathering together all light of the world in him as in a focal point. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us" (2 Cor. 5, 20): in this wooing lies the merit and at the same time the force of the unique man. His myth may as permanent edifice awaken many a misgiving – especially where compulsory articles of faith are forged out of it; his mysticism may in many a relation strike other paths – more brooding, darkly-philosophical – than the childishly-bright, smilingly-self-certain mysticism of the Saviour: to all that in this case subordinate value attaches; for Paul recognises "the one thing needful," namely, to lead the men to Jesus: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3, 17 ff.).

VI. The Christian Church and the Religion of Jesus

We shall all gradually come from a Christianity of the word ever more to a Christianity of disposition and of deed; out of a teaching-community must ever more become a disposition-community, a deed-community. (Goethe)

Everything reliable that we know about Jesus of Nazareth stems from the two sources that we have subjected to a critical consideration – the Gospels and the letters of the messenger Paul. This "everything" can at the same time be designated as very little and as world-filling: so little that under the hands of many specialised scholars scarcely anything remains, and so much that already John meant that if one wished to describe everything "one by one, the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." We may assert that almost everything high-hearted, noble-minded, sublime that for two thousand years has been accomplished upon earth by men derives itself immediately or mediately from the stimulations given by those writings. Uniquely fashioned source-writings, to which the entire history of mankind would know nothing to set beside them! What restricts their significance as testimonies about Jesus of Nazareth – about his life and his words – and insofar admonishes us to caution, that we have openly and distinctly and – as I hope – with sufficient exhaustiveness admitted to ourselves; I do not fear that any thinking-capable and free man will contradict our results: it lies, as the reader must have convinced himself, everything clear before the eyes; we must only learn to open the eyes. One need by no means fear that these writings through such a reflection lose in content and value; rather everyone will experience that they issue purified and as it were rejuvenated out of it. Those men, manifoldly entangled in confused conceptions of their time, may have suffered loss in the freedom of their receptivity; yet their radiant truthfulness remained unstained, and no error and confusion was capable of extinguishing the Divine that they had simply experienced and of which they then bore witness, or of disfiguring it to unrecognisability. Neither the individual man nor the succession of the generations of men ever learns to an end upon these books; rather they increase with the centuries in content, in that every new time, by force of its new peculiarity, uncovers things at which earlier times had heedlessly passed by. This imperishable, always equally near to every present, is nothing other than the pure reflection of the appearance of Jesus Christ upon earth: with the three first evangelists more immediate and more naïve, with Paul and John more deeply rooted and more glowing, yet with all true and pure, with all with a highest measure of unconsciously shaping force of inspiration. Wholly of another kind was what now followed, and indeed from the first moment onward: if one wished to designate the further progress with a single word, one might well speak of an increasing removal from the religion of Jesus – from the religion of the Father and of his kingdom. Here we have to behold historical necessity at work – perhaps God-willed, perhaps only conditioned by human limitedness; yet, be that as it may, the fact must be acknowledged as fact and can also be so, without misrecognition or bitterness. To none of the numerous attempts at reformation – of which the first set in at the beginning of the 5th century – did it ever succeed to root out from the ground the mass of the upshot and firmly rooted conceptions that alienated our Saviour from us. However intimately near Luther again led us to the in regard to religious instinct and to religious life-force strongly related Paul and thereby to the core of the teaching of Jesus, he remained hopelessly entangled in Jewish historical delusion and in Hellenistic dogmatics. Besides, the teaching of the divine inspiration of the literal wording of the biblical writings, as the reformers of the 16th century drove it to the extreme, and which in this shape had been thoroughly foreign even to Jerome and to Augustine, this teaching, I say, which the reformers erected as bulwark against the increasing influence of the ecclesiastical traditions, forms an insurmountable obstacle for every unprejudiced occupation with the Gospels and the letters of Paul; it presses down the truly Divine in them through equation with the very humanly conditioned, limited, – and the end-result is a renewed alienation of our Saviour. To the reader of the two preceding chapters I need not first demonstrate this. If now in our endeavour to find our way back to Jesus we are left in the lurch even by the most outstanding Christians in one or the other relation, then the question presses itself upon us: by what is this caused?

If we see those men who dedicate their whole life to the one goal of winning the men for the faith in Christ, and who go into death for this, nevertheless push him far from us or make him inaccessible, and remark that the whole Church goes the same way and its mediation in consequence means at the same time a separation, then – as remarked earlier – the conjecture lies near that here historically or thought-conditioned necessities held sway. The reflection upon that, as also upon the possibility of gaining a nearer relation to the religion of Jesus, shall this last chapter be dedicated to. Let us at once consider the first step upon the way to the human circumscription of the God-given shape. According to the agreeing report of the three first Gospels the Apostle Peter took this first step, in that he, on the occasion of the stay in Caesarea Philippi, spoke to the Saviour: "Thou art the Messiah." About the reception of this word by the one thus addressed Mark – that one of the evangelists who stands nearest to Peter – reports merely the strict rejection: "And he charged them that they should tell no man of him" (according to the oldest text); likewise we read with Luke: "And he straitly charged them, and commanded them to tell no man that thing"; whereas Matthew (16, 16 ff.) – lets Jesus full of joy cry out: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven!" – whereupon then the mention of the to-be-founded ecclesia happens as also the bestowal of the key-power upon Peter: the whole, without question, a late insertion from the side of the Church, about which Merx writes: "The historical research about Jesus may not let itself be deceived for eternity by such a falsification; there must be an end" (Evangelien 3, 320). A comparative glance at the report about the same incident with John will open our eyes about the true state of affairs. First he narrates – what the others do not do – the occasion for the utterance of Peter: Jesus had just presented the teaching of the divine grace in its purity and sharpness – "No man can come to me, except it were given unto him of my Father" – and thereupon many who had hitherto followed him departed "and walked no more with him." Then the Saviour asked the few remaining: "Will ye also go away?" Whereupon Peter answers: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Thus not the Messiah, but a Holy One, not a historical hero of Judah, but a divine appearance! The one John had long recognised the impossibility of forcing the appearance of his divine Master into the narrow artificial concept of a Messiah of the Jews and here in conscious, willed contrast to the earlier Gospels improves the wording of Peter. The Church, however, did not at all like that, and although all the Greek principal texts unanimously bring "thou art the Holy One of God" and the oldest Latin correspondingly writes Tu es sanctus Dei, Jerome strikes out the "Holy One" and calmly sets in its place Tu es Christus filius Dei, Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, and almost all follow his example – including Luther's – up to the present day. Already out of this first step we gain a kind of epitome of all future ecclesiastical teaching-formation. A vigorous man of the people, of tenderly feeling soul, yet of definitely limited understanding, one of those men with whom Goethe teaches us not to wish to distinguish between faith and superstition, seeks to incorporate to himself an overpowering present by interpretation, in that he draws near a conception diffused in the people which satisfies his needs and procures him direction and rest; one may also say: since his spiritual horizon is restricted by Judaism, he does not wrong in calling hither the highest conception known to him – the concept of an expected Messiah – for the explanation of the incomprehensible wonder that suddenly overshines his life. Only, however, for him and his like can this conception claim a certain (conditioned) validity; to force it upon others means, well considered, a monstrosity. That already John – the sole exalted man among the immediate disciples – has felt and therefore put more appropriate words into the mouth of Peter – the wonderful saying: "Thou hast the words of eternal life! Thou art a Holy One of God!" – Now, however, comes the Church and Yet I interrupt myself, for I believe I hear the interjection: "Thou speakest of the Church; who, however, and what is the Church?" It is known that in this case – as in so many another – an exact and generally valid definition of the concept offers exceedingly great difficulties; yet one may not let oneself be made anxious thereby; one may calmly assert that everyone knows from experience what he has to represent to himself under Church; only the answer will turn out differently according to the degree of education and the kind of education.

I would approximately say: a Church is the arrangement to summarise as large a number of men as possible into a unity by this, that their higher soul-stirrings – their fearing and their hoping, their divining and dreaming, their moral striving and the longing toward Above – are as far as possible banned into a like and equally ordered series of conceptions, so that all members of that unity in the essential points agree exactly with one another. In one relation a totality gains through this procedure undeniably mightily in value, since the more weakly gifted, poorer in imagination, poorer in knowledge are carried along by the better equipped and elevated upon a moral height that they, left to themselves, never could have reached: the holy commonality, which to demand constitutes an essential trait of all religion, lets itself impossibly be realised if not some kind of outer summary mediates it. The merits of the ecclesiastical thought for mankind, and especially the merits of the Christian Church, are immeasurably great; an attempt to enumerate them would lead very far and is also not at all necessary, since they lie open before all eyes. Unfortunately these services are dearly paid! Already in the mere intention to lead the soul-life of differently constituted men upon like ways lies violence, and in the greater measure the unification succeeds, the more violently this suggestive power – this infusion of conceptions and convictions – works upon the human interior.

The danger of the abuse on the part of the leading ones lies so near that this cannot be averted for the duration: that lies founded in the human essence itself and therefore returns with the regularity of a law of nature. Scarcely has Paul founded churches, and already he must complain that the leaders of the communities do not content themselves "with the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ," but bring in "questions and strifes of words," while in reality under this apparent care for a refined teaching only the intention hides itself to make "of religion a source of gain" (1 Tim. 6, 3 ff.). The acquiring would be the least; far more fatal works the boundless lust of dominion of the priests – a passion that can grow in such a manner that it shrinks back before no crime. And while the priesthood gets upon such ways, the confessors are educated into thoughtless yes-yes-sayers or into shameless hypocrites, and the proper religion – as most immediate inner experience – is lost. Kant judges: "One does most men too much honour to say of them: they confess themselves to this or that religion; for they know and demand none; the statutory church-faith is everything that they understand under this word" (Religion, p. 155). Thus it comes finally to this, that that institution which is to save and harbour and further religion, instead of that suppresses it with countless men and even extinguishes it; as Goethe also lets his pastor write, "that the teaching of Christ was nowhere more oppressed than in the Christian Church." This little may suffice for our momentary purpose; let us return to Peter, whom we heard in the simplicity of his heart speaking the word "Thou art the Messiah," and to John, whose great soul recoiled before the inadmissibility of this utterance, and who therefore lets his brother speak: "Thou hast the words of eternal life, thou art the Holy One of God." Now, however, comes the Church, which with unerring instinct recognised the value of the utterance "Thou art the Messiah" for the fortification of its own foundation and therefore felt the improvement of John as disturbing; and what does it do? It simply strikes out the Johannine text and replaces it by a statement agreeing with the preceding Gospels; besides it weaves into the Gospel of Matthew – over whose wording it seems to have disposed longer than over that of the other texts – the earlier mentioned, freely invented insertion, through which bold falsification it succeeds in letting Jesus himself – over whose lips the word "Church" has never come – to stamp him as the express founder of the Christian Church, and still of a Church with key-bearing all-powerful clergy – him who before the priests always again warns as before the greatest danger for all religion (see p. 118)!

Thus proceeds the Church, the alleged guardian of the Holy Scripture, she who bans the one who doubts the immediate divine inspiration of every word of the New Testament: she herself unhesitatingly reaches into the text and does not shy from even putting invented utterances into the mouth of the Saviour, upon which she then founds her compulsory teachings and the dominating position of the priesthood! Already in the preceding chapters we were manifoldly made attentive to examples – I recall especially the alleged baptismal command of the Lord with Matthew (28, 19) and refer besides to pages 230 ff.

For us all it is of decisive importance to grasp such facts in their significance; for they repeat themselves step for step – was yet already by oldest and especially holy church-fathers the *pia fraus*, the "pious fraud," unreservedly advised.

The good intention with such violent proceedings shall not be doubted, still less the clever insight that hereby worked determiningly: the Church always manifested a downright astonishing degree of worldly cleverness and knowledge of men; always her resolutions directed themselves according to the taste and the needs of the great majority of the moderately gifted; thereby she won herself the world. One can designate the Church as "religion become politics." Now, however, to drive politics means to strive after power and success: if, however, a community that sets itself no worldly goals strives after power and success, then in her the pure concept of all politics realises itself; here politics is driven for the sake of politics: out of that I explain to myself the security of the Church bordering upon the fabulous. It now leaps into the eyes that such a direction from the beginning will remove from genuine religion and with time lead to more or less perfect opposition to it. And so it happens that, in that the Christian Church gradually piles her walls higher and higher, vaults a roof over her and fills her window-gaps with coloured glasses, she indeed accomplishes a great admirable work that probably upon no other way could have let itself be accomplished, a work to which we also owe what is worthy of reverence, – that she however at the same time step for step more completely excludes the Father, whom Jesus has brought us as God, out of her building, as also the kingdom of the Father, which stands open to everyone in every moment, without other mediation than the faith bestowed through Jesus – to everyone, also to the adulteress and the sinful woman, yes even still to the criminal upon the cross of punishment (p. 132). Jesus himself, who with his invitation to follow him and to take "his easy yoke" upon us stood so intimately near to us, is now shifted into immeasurable distances and is represented upon earth by the high-priest, the *Pontifex maximus*; it is the Church that possesses the keys to the kingdom of heaven. Correspondingly the blind faith in the infallible Church now becomes the principal affair of all religion. This is not to be understood figuratively; rather the Catechism, issued after the decisions of the Council of Trent for the pastors upon command of the Popes Pius V and Clement XIII, expressly determines in the discussion of the 9th Article of the Apostolic Creed – "I believe in one holy catholic Church" – this article "is of all to be most frequently impressed upon the people" (*nonus articulus omnium frequentissime populo inculcandus est*), – thus confesses without further ado that the faith in the Church is more important and more decisive than the faith in God and than the faith in Jesus Christ! In the expositions to this instruction to the pastors it is then also said that "not everyone is to be called a heretic who errs in the faith, but solely the one who depreciates the authority of the Church" [Footnote: I use the complete edition of the Catechism that appeared in Regensburg 1896 with permission of the Archbishop of Bamberg according to the authentic Roman edition of the year 1855.].

One note above all the following: through the activity of the Church the concept of faith experiences a deeply going transformation. For the oldest Christians – as for Jesus himself and for Paul – "to believe" meant an elevation of the whole essence upward to God, an unconditional trust in his presence and loving help; even their sworn opponent Celsus shows himself strongly impressed by the depth and unconquerability of this mood of mind that is common to all Christians and knits them together into a firm unity, although they in their remaining conceptions went far apart (cf. Origen: *Against Celsus*, after Hatch).

Yet this force of innocence did not last long, and characteristic is what here first intervened disturbingly. It was this the question after the deity of Jesus Christ, which at the same time inevitably occasioned a number of other questions concerning the deity: was it the One God who had descended to the earth? should one assume several gods? how was the incarnation to be thought? was the essence of the Saviour upon earth to be assumed as a twofold one – a divine and at the same time a human? and should not the divine soul before the death on the cross have driven to heaven, leaving the human alone to the sufferings? or should even the whole appearance of the God upon earth have been a sensory deception and God in reality have despised the perishable flesh-body?

Is God – as Jesus had taught – a unity, how can he at the same time have throned in heaven and suffered upon earth?

Was however Jesus only God, not man, has he not really shared life and suffering with us men, with what right can he then be called the "second Adam," the "new heavenly man"? and does he then not forfeit a great part of his significance – well the most essential – for us men?

These questions, and still a hundred further ones, set themselves in of themselves, to the Christians for torment and strife, as soon as the watchword "Jesus Christ is God" had become general. From the disciples brought up in the Jewish faith it did not go forth – that we have seen in earlier chapters; against this the thought of the deity of Jesus lay so near to Greeks and Asia-Minor people that it so to speak inevitably had to set itself in. These men found everywhere Divine – every spring animated an Immortal, out of every tree they perceived voices of extra-human beings; the reader will be mindful of the episode in Lystra, where the Hellenic-Lycaonian population without further ado assumed that Barnabas was Zeus and Paul Hermes (*Acts*, Chap. 14): a Greek who took up the instruction about Jesus as mediator could for no moment be in doubt about his deity: it is with him a matter of a completely naïve conception of the Divine brought down from primeval time. Now, however, the Christian conception of God linked historically on to the one God Yahveh, and religiously on to Christ's teaching of the Father: therefore new problems arose as soon as Jesus also was to be named God. Paul had been held back by a finer instinct: he placed the mediator close, quite close to God, yet did not take the last step. As soon as this was done, Yahveh and the Father had to begin to waver, and a new teaching of God, a new myth of infinite complication had to be invented and carpentered. This again had as consequence that Jesus' teaching of the present kingdom of heaven, as also the whole world-view into which alone such a teaching lets itself be fitted, was pushed into the background and soon wholly and entirely forgotten, since the new teaching of God took the attention fully into claim, so much so that we may assert that all theology of the first centuries was "teaching of God" and all formation of dogma – i.e. every setting-up of compulsory articles of faith – concerned the deity alone. The most beautiful among the early defence-writings of Christianity – the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix – mentions neither the name of Jesus Christ nor the Gospels (see Boissier: *La Fin du Paganisme*, 1, 280), and when Emperor Theodosius in the year 380 elevates orthodoxy to law, there is likewise no talk of the Saviour, but solely of "the deity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in equal majesty and venerable Trinity"; whoever confesses this faith, "he shall, so we command, bear the name of a catholic Christian, the remaining ones, however, whom we declare for insane and raging, shall bear the disgrace of heretical teaching" (Krüger: *Dreieinigkeit*, p. 186).

The conception of a triune God roots, wherever it also occurs, in the old-Indian teaching of the Trimurti; the Church received it from the Greek secret-science (*Gnosis*), and for a long time the endless feuds that the nearer determinations of this article of faith called forth were conducted almost exclusively by Hellenically educated men: therefore the knowing no bounds subtlety and the revelling in definitions of concepts and ungraspable distinctions: upon the first councils the bishops and their adherents fell upon one another with clubs because of an epithet or otherwise a particle of speech, and the ban-curses flew back and forth between the venerable fathers. When the Latin world gained the upper hand, it soon with its higher sense for unitary government-politics made an end to the carryingon and toward the year 500 issued the definitive trinitarian creed, which it – in order to give it weight – ascribed to the holy Athanasius, and which still today claims binding validity for Protestants as for Catholics. And there we read as follows: "Whoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.

The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensible(s), nor three uncreated, but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Ghost almighty. And yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord, so are we forbidden by the catholic religion to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of none, neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other; none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity."

How far do we find ourselves here from the God whom Jesus under the name "Father" had so immediately familiarly unlocked to our hearts! "Father, Thy kingdom come!" And how infinitely far from the kingdom of this Father, which like a tree, without our doing, encompasses and over-shelters us, while in its branches the little birds of heaven nest and sing (p. 99)! If the One deserves to be named a religion, then to the Other another name must belong: the One seizes the human essence in its depths, wholly transforming receptive minds, yet to all bestowing consolation in suffering, force in weakness, confidence in despondency, – it asks not after sins, but solely after disposition; the faith that it demands consists of a living movement and is thoroughly no process accompanied by heavy thoughts, still less by metaphysical cognitions, rather – as the Apostle Paul says – "with the heart man believeth" (*Rom.* 10, 9); the Other represents a product of school-like thinking and is according to intention and content at all only to be understood with a definite course of education, and indeed with the success that, the more exactly the intertwined assertions are considered, the more distinctly the whole is recognised as pure formal air-cobweb, out of which no proper thought is to be gained, because no kind of intuition lies at the base – and "concepts without intuition remain empty" (Kant), – that it offers the heart nothing need not first be said. And thereby this gruesome lovelessness: everyone for eternity excluded from the blessedness who does not solemnly assent to this violation of the brain! The Saviour had taught that in order to enter into the kingdom of the Father the man must again become a child; the Church has known it otherwise.

One throw me not in that this holds only of the Roman Church; for, as already remarked above, the Athanasian Creed possesses just as decisive significance for the Protestant churches [Footnote: For the Oriental Church this creed also holds, with exception of the one double-word *filioque*, since the Orientals teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, not also from the Son. This one word has led to the separation between the two great churches of the East and of the West.]. Also here the same spirit reigns. In order to convince oneself thereof, one look up in the great, much-praised textbook of Lutheran dogmatics: *Christ's Person and Work*, from the middle of the previous century, by G. Thomasius; one will find the point for point equal presentation of the Trinity and at the close the remark that whoever does not think equally about the deity of Christ is not to be named a Christian. In order moreover to give a conception of the thought-world in which such men still today live, I will copy out of the explanatory "proofs" that Thomasius gives the one: "In that the Father turns toward us in the Son, for the sake of the Son, his gracious good-pleasure, he distinguishes himself from the Son; in that the Son represents us with the Father, he sets himself over against him as an Other; in that the Holy Spirit glorifies Christ in us and through him leads us to the Father, he distinguishes himself from both. We have thus here immanent acts, real differences" (Abs. 13, p. 69).

That is yet not to be named religion in the sense of Christ; and I add, it is just as little science, but a play with words. There I praise to myself the brave Roman presbyter Hippolytus, from the beginning of the 3rd century, who simply set the matter right for himself: “When it pleased God to be born, he through his birth became his own Son” (after Hatch) – to rest with this wisdom I find genial. In reality all talk about God is superfluous, because sense-empty: we saw in the first chapter that the forms of our understanding do not suffice to say anything whatever about the deity, and in the third we saw Jesus content himself with the conception of a Father – “my Father, your Father” – and only still in individual parables bring near to us the love and care of this Father. Were anyone in a position to communicate to us something worth knowing and necessary to know about the deity in the language of the human reason, then it would have been He, the mediator; so, however, it remains with the *neti, neti* of the

Indian wise men: God is not so, and he is not so. Certainly the Saviour would have assented to the word of the pious Eckhart: “Be silent and clatter not of God, for with the so that thou clatterest of him, so liest thou!”

None the less we would not do well if we wished only to break the staff over the old church-fathers and their thought-necessities. The English philosopher Caird makes in his book *The Evolution of Theology* (2, 359 ff.) attentive to the fact that especially in the first time these efforts around more exact definitions of concepts regarding the deity in reality mean a wrestling after understanding of the relation between man and God. It had seemed so simple to assert of Jesus of Nazareth that he is God – and now all at once thereby everything had begun to waver, both the God-being of God and the manbeing of the man: for the one thing the church-fathers knew – and for that they deserve our thankful admiration –, they knew that the Saviour – in order to be Saviour – must have been man and that, if this did not stand firm, Christianity would go out of breath of life. This threatening danger they now sought to steer through the multiplication of the concept of God, without for that having to sacrifice the unity of God. As soon as one understands that, one learns to recognise that to these confused and seemingly wholly useless fantasies a religious motive lies at the base, and indeed an extremely important one; these men went through soul-torments and fought a hero-combat in which not merely the holy earnestness of their striving reveals itself, but also an imposing gift and an excellent schooling of the logical thought-forces. It is true they willed an impossible, yet the goal of this willing was a highest, which they had to reach at any price.

In order to gain the right understanding, it is necessary to note a fact that to most laymen still today remains unknown, because the results of scientific research spread themselves peculiarly slowly: the early Christianity is – outside Palestine – a religion of the educated middle-class, from where it tends rather to spread upward than downward; a folk-religion it can only in a very conditioned sense of the word be named; everywhere the peasants are the last who let themselves be converted, and mostly only under application of violence. This religion first took foot solely in cities, preferentially in traffic-rich ones with mixed population; and indeed scholars, physicians, officials, merchants, philosophers, people from the imperial court confessed themselves to it; there is also no lack of rich Christians whose corpses, wrapped in gold-worked stuffs, the catacombs still today harbour. Most of the early churchteachers are well-to-do men, many among them belong to the nobility. Thus the more exact research of the documents and of the inscriptions has revealed to us a wholly other picture of the beginnings of the Christian Church than the traditional one – which, I fear, still today generally holds – of a community of the poor in spirit and in possession.

I refer for all particulars to the series of the fundamental works of Ramsay, as also to Harnack's *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*; besides I make attentive to James Orr's: *Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity* and to George Edmundson's: *The Church in Rome in the First Century*; further I recommend two somewhat older French books: the path-breaking one of Beugnot: *Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident*, and Gaston Boissier's form-perfect: *La Fin du Paganisme*.

This fact is now decisive for the early history of the Christian Church: for to be educated meant to be Greek-educated; the Greek education had conquered the whole Roman Empire; there was no other education; also in Rome all teachers were either Greeks or Hellenists of oriental origin, at most Romans who had applied themselves to their studies in Athens or Alexandria; the language of all Christian communities – no matter whether in Gaul, in Rome, in Phrygia or in Egypt – is in the first time the Greek; all the writings that were united into the New Testament are composed in Greek language. If therefore – as Professor Ramsay assures us (*Galatians*, p. 201) – still in the 3rd century Christianity was almost solely to be found among the educated, then one sees from that how much time this direction has had to impress its stamp upon the Christian teaching. Now from of old the skirmishing with words and concepts was the highest lust of the Greek – Socrates is a genuine type of this folk-disposition; with the loss of the state independence the earlier fundamental pillars of the Hellenic education – the bodily exercises and the music – fell away; the word-revelling alone remained. The so-called "education" consisted of three subjects: logic, rhetoric and dialectic – germanised: art of thinking, art of speaking, art of word-strife. What those men all loved, wherein they alone possessed skill, was in consequence the setting-up of subtle definitions of concepts and distinctions and endless speech-skirmishing, besides to hold display-speeches, no matter over what subject, since it came solely upon the How, not upon the What. The Hellenic sense for the form experiences here, at the end of its course and mostly already fallen into race-foreign hands, a sad aberration; for us of today it remains a riddle how educated men can have found pleasure in such products.

Yet we will beware of premature judgments, and especially with such historically infinitely complicated relations before one-sided simplifying judgments, as they easily befall the half-informed man and falsify his world-picture. How great a thing those men achieved with their impossible formulas of the Trinity! Through these articles of faith they turned aside from the rising Christianity two opposed dangers. Each of these dangers would have brought about its early ruin: the stiffening into the poor Jewish belief in one God, and the splitting into the boundless multiplication of the Hellenic fantasy of gods. We still received an over-great load of Yahveh-superstition. This load has weighed heavy on the ship of Christianity from the first hour until the present day. Yet the new doctrine of God prevented the complete sinking into Judaism. For Yahveh there remains no place in the Trinity. He is never named in the negotiations that filled centuries about the nature of the Godhead. He limps along only as an eternally foreign inheritance that cannot be taken in. If the layman wishes a lively picture of the second threat—the Hellenic one—he should look in Herder's fine treatise: On the Son of God, the Saviour of the World, according to the Gospel of John (sections 27 ff.). There he will find various systems of the Greek Gnosis (secret science) described more clearly than in other books. I take one single example from him. I choose the system of Basilides, an Alexandrian Christian. He holds special fame as the author of the earliest explanatory writing on a New Testament book—a commentary on the Gospel of John: "God, the highest unnamed Being; Matter equally eternal with God. Seven perfect Aeons, brought forth immediately from God; he himself the eighth.

Angels in 365 orders and heavens. Their first order alone is brought forth by the perfect Aeons. The others have created themselves in order. The head of them all is a good but imperfect spirit. In fellowship with this good but imperfect spirit the angels built the world from the eternal Matter, after the image that the Aeon 'Wisdom' set before them. They formed man after the image of the heavenly Man that an Aeon brought them.

The world-creators, who had divided the rule of the world among themselves according to nations, fell and let themselves be worshipped instead of the highest God. The Jew-God in particular caused much harm. To help the misery of men the only-begotten Son of God, the Aeon 'pure Understanding', came to earth. He seeks to destroy the rule of the fallen world-rulers, especially of the Jew-God, and to make men happy through knowledge of the true God and through laying aside of the passions. The Jew-God stirred the nation against him: he was killed. The pure souls reach, like Christ, the place where they first were; the imperfect ones wander into other bodies until full purification." Such gnostic systems of teaching shot up by the dozen—some of them full of deep, witty ideas. One could raise little objection if they offered themselves as the free myth-making of thought by educated men who have leisure. Far from that, they wish in all seriousness to furnish a usable scheme of faith for the religion of Jesus Christ! One thinks one watches the doings of madmen. I believe in truth that a mental disease is present here, of the kind that alienists call "monomania." In it a man otherwise fully healthy has lost all judgment in relation to one single object and therefore resembles a madman. Favoured by special circumstances this disease planted itself from brain to brain, so that at last one may speak of a mass disease. Here the teachers of the Church stepped in with energy. Their way of thought also stems from the gnostic world of thought. One does justice to the doctrine of the Trinity only when one learns to see it as a phenomenon of the Greek secret science. Yet what fundamental simplification it carries through! And how firmly it holds the main point—the manhood of Jesus Christ—in view! And how practical is the introduction of the forced faith, through which alone the disease just named was healed and the threatening chaos was driven back! All that has been said holds in exactly the same measure for the Logos-doctrine of God of the Apostle John ("In the beginning was the Word" etc.): the concept of the Logos, its conception as "emanation" of the Godhead—all is taken over literally from the Gnosis. That doctrine, which lies wholly outside the doctrine of the Trinity, forms a parallel attempt to overcome the Gnosis through Gnosis. And here also, what victorious simplification and what emphasis on the manhood of Jesus Christ! "And the Word became flesh"…. The whole Gospel has as its one goal to lead men back to the living Jesus, who already then began under the hands of the Gnostics to evaporate into an abstract being of thought. We know that it was also a chief care of the doctrine of the Trinity to set the perfect manhood of the Saviour beyond doubt: this formed the most indispensable task of the early Church. Nowhere does its instinct for the essential deserve more admiration: whoever sacrifices the historical Jesus ruins Christianity.

For clearer insight into the kind of thought-guidance that suited that time I earlier gave the first half of the Athanasian Creed; it concerned only the Godhead. Now I let the second half follow, which undertakes to solve the problem of the God-manhood. I recall that this final wording of the Creed arose only after the beginning of the Latin age of the Church. This brought about considerable simplification and the loss of many fine shades that can be expressed only in the Greek language. In Greek one can let ideas float and fade and float into one another; in Latin everything presents itself as iron and firmly walled. "It is further necessary to everlasting salvation that one also believe faithfully the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. So now the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man: God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man of the substance of the mother, born in the world. Perfect God, perfect Man, consisting of a reasonable soul and human flesh. Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood. Who although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ, Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven etc." It needs no proof that no unbiased thinking man of the present day can find satisfaction in such conceptual tricks; if he does, he deceives himself.

For if one already wishes to dissect unfathomable mysteries in thought, at least every member must hold a graspable sense—which is not the case here. If there should be people among us who really do not feel the contradictions and the conceptual impossibilities in such a statement, I recommend them to look up in Friedrich Loofs' little book Who was Jesus Christ? the pages 179 and following and let themselves be instructed by this believing Christian. Already Augustine remarked that in the Church doctrine the concept "person" is taken in two meanings, namely differently where the Trinity is spoken of than where the incarnation of Jesus Christ is spoken of. "If really only the second person of the Trinity became man, then the three persons are plainly so independent toward one another, also in working outward, that they present themselves as three gods, but not as the one God." This is clear at the first glance; the deeper one sinks into such a creed, the more unbearable the impossibilities demanded of thought prove themselves: in reality the doctrine of the incarnation of the one divine person bursts the doctrine of the Trinity; and besides the concept of a being that at the same time is God and truly man proves itself wholly ungraspable for the understanding: one need only read in Loofs. His closing words also are worth heeding; they turn to the pious believers who reject such considerations as irreverent and poor: "Had these good Christians a notion of how much unworthy theological wrangling was effective before these 'mysteries' received their present theological form, they would not be able to hold reason-grounds against these orthodox doctrines that grew out of much reasoning as unjustified." That the Christians of the first centuries thought differently from us we will not hold against them: we learned the spiritual world that surrounded them and understand that they had to grasp at such a procedure and also found their satisfaction in it. For the last time let it be repeated: a double goal hovered before them—first, without polytheism to dissect the Godhead multiply; second, to prove it possible that Jesus was God and at the same time real man on earth. Both they attempted through pure distinctions of understanding, that is through mental acrobat-tricks; yet what does it matter? They reached the goals that hovered before them—that may suffice. Schiller once teaches tolerance toward "tasteless ideas"; he means: "an idea may, considered in isolation, be very adventurous, but perhaps …. in a certain connection with others that perhaps seem equally tasteless, form a very purposeful member" (Letter to Körner of 1.12.88). These words I find applicable to those men who under the expenditure of fervent drive of research laboriously built up the Christian myth. Before we now go on to give ourselves an account of the meaning of this turn of Christianity to forced articles of faith concerning the unfathomable mysteries of the Godhead, and put before us the question how we of today wish to stand toward it,—we must cast a glance at a second line of development that grew up parallel and transformed the original community of the "saints" who esteemed one another equal into a Church ruled by priests. In truth these two movements go hand in hand and further each other: the one presupposes the other, and they grow high together. One should not judge it as chance that the first real Pope—Leo I.—is contemporary with the introduction of the Athanasian Creed. Originally the formation of the Church concerned merely a free joining together of all who believed in Jesus Christ as mediator between man and God, for mutual support and mutual protection,—the founding of a community of brotherly love in Jesus Christ. A council of the elders (Presbyters) administered the common business; messengers and servants (in Greek Diakone) carried out his directions, visited the sick, cared for the needy; one should look up in the Acts of the Apostles (6,1 ff.) the account of the first choice of deacons who "cared for the table-service." Very soon in larger communities—following the example of Roman administrative art—the necessity of an overseer (episkopos) arose. Common to these various officials was that they arose from the choice of all community members, that they served, not commanded, and that they were charged chiefly with practical questions, not with care of souls, still less that they formed a preferred spiritual estate within the community.

Nevertheless these leaders appointed by free choice of the community soon gained decisive influence also in questions of faith; that could not fail—for the deacons went from house to house, bringing counsel and help; one chose as Presbyters, and still more as bishops, those men who enjoyed the most general reverence; and I add at once, this influence had to redound to the blessing of the young communities; for we know from the letters of Paul how confused and wild it sometimes went there, where neither articles of faith nor acts of worship directed themselves according to fixed determinations (2 Cor. 10 ff.). Decisive is, however, that the concept of a special and separated priesthood remains unknown to the Gospels and the Epistles, and also to the communities for a long time yet. From stage to stage develops—and again we must say in immediate contradiction to the teachings of Jesus Christ—the concept of a spiritual estate distinguished from the lay estate: through the works of Lightfoot and others it is made easy for us to follow the course of this fateful conception. For the sake of simplification I limit myself to three stages of this development, each of which will be illustrated for us by a famous name: Ignatius, Irenaeus and Cyprian. Ignatius the martyr, whom we have already met several times in this book and who died about the year 110, stresses repeatedly in his letters the high meaning of the bishops for the cohesion of the communities, yet he does it always in the sense of a request directed to the community members to grasp the importance of the unity represented by the bishop, without which the newly born Christianity would within a short time certainly fly apart again into atoms. “Just as the Lord did nothing without the

Father, so you should undertake nothing without the bishop and the Presbyters. Let not the individual among you attempt to think something right without the participation of the others: rather let there be a common prayer, a common calling, a common spirit, a common hope in love and in blameless joy— which is Jesus Christ, above whom nothing goes.” From these words one understands exactly what the noble, experienced old man aims at, who all his life had to suffer under the divisions of the communities that he led, and one will also meet the following words, which at first seem peculiar to us, with understanding: “Be obedient to your bishop and obedient toward one another!” (Letter to the Magnesians, sections 7 and 13). About sixty to eighty years later—thus after two generations—we hear Irenaeus, the active bishop of Lyons, stress the high meaning of the episcopal office ever anew strongly, yet the standpoint is strikingly shifted; no longer is it a matter, as with Ignatius, of the organic centre of the community constitution, thus in a sense a political, in any case a practical matter; rather the weight now lies on the questions of faith. Irenaeus lives at a time when a hundred different teachings within the young Christianity contend for predominance, and he means that those bishops who descend in direct line from the Apostles—as is the case with those of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus and Smyrna—are eo ipso the keepers of the genuine apostolic tradition. “If you wish to learn the genuine teaching of the Apostles, inquire at the apostolic churches. In the succession of the bishops, whose first ones were appointed by the Apostles themselves, you possess the guarantee for the propagation of the pure faith, a guarantee which no isolated upstart offers who dares from his own power to teach.” How arbitrary this invention of an alleged apostolic tradition was is proved by the simple fact that the reverend lord bishops contradicted one another and banned one another from the Church, and that on their assemblies they determined the individual points of the teaching by majority decisions: in the need in which the Church found itself, however, such an idea served for calming and strengthening. Yet the teaching of the decisive meaning of the episcopal dignity was to take yet a great step further, and again about two generations later. Toward the middle of the third century the fiery African Cyprian flourished and carried through with the teaching that the bishop is appointed neither from practical considerations of unified administration, nor does his dignity rest merely on apostolic consecration, but rather his power stems from an unshakable law of God. The bishop, so Cyprian teaches, is appointed immediately by God, is responsible only to God and is enlightened immediately by God.

"You should know, the bishop is the embodiment of the Church and the Church the embodiment of the bishop; if one does not follow his bishop, he no longer belongs to the Church, whatever those may flatter themselves who in discord with the priests of God imagine that they still secretly deal with God. The Church is catholic and one …. cemented together by the priests who agree with one another." The bishop is to be regarded less as the crowning roof of the Church building than as its foundation-stone; he is the only and therefore indispensable mediator of the divine grace (cf. the writing of Cyprian on The Unity of the Church as well as many of his letters, among them especially the one to Florentius Pupianus). Cyprian carried through with his views, and therewith the conception of the Church as a priestly regiment had finally triumphed: the further, namely the sharpening to the Papacy, could not fail and set in of itself within the following two centuries. Likewise the law of celibacy, whereby the priests were separated out of human society and out of the order of nature and placed in the exclusive service of the

Church. True, the Apostle Peter used to take his wife with him on his missionary journeys, and the Apostle Paul even expressly ordains that the bishops and deacons should be married men (1 Tim. 3,2 and 12); yet against the logic of the ecclesiastical priestly will an apostolic word is as little able as a word of the Saviour. The final sealing of the priestly power happened through the carrying through of the forced article of faith of the change (Transsubstantiation), a teaching thanks to which the consecrated priest alone became capable of preparing and administering "the magic means of immortality" (p. 64); whoever stood outside the Church, even if he possessed all virtues and believed fervently in God, might expect nothing other than hell-fire. Even the Church needed more than a thousand years to make men soft for the acceptance of this monstrosity. True, soon thereafter the Reformation stepped onto the scene and set the lever precisely at this point; yet it itself still stuck far too deep in Hellenic formulas of faith and in Jewish historical materialism for it to have been able to press through to full liberation, and only all too soon "the arch-catholic Protestants"—as Kant calls them—bloomed in the shape of intolerant Lutheran clergy. Through this conception of the Church as guardian of an orthodoxy set up by the priests themselves, triumphant on the whole line, one of the most precious achievements of classical culture was extinguished and made undone: we men fell again under the dominion of the "medicine-man," the priest—a tyranny of the soul which Greeks and Romans of the flowering time had overcome. This tyranny was even more perfectly organized than its predecessors in Babylon and in Egypt, and moreover unequally stronger, thanks to the single treasure of moral values that it had inherited from Jesus Christ and carried with it for the greater part ununderstood in the Gospels. Now we have, I believe, gathered enough material to judge the influence that the ecclesiastical development of Christianity has exercised on the religion of Jesus, as well as on the conception of religion in general: in such a question less depends on fullness than on right, sharp grasp of the guiding lines;—where such lie so unambiguously in the open as in this case, one need really only take to heart the sapere aude (dare to be wise), and everything lies clear before one's eyes. Two such guiding lines we have followed through several centuries: the one concerned the innermost, the need of faith inborn in man, the other concerned the outer articulation of human society in relation to this same religious longing: I believe the reader will, even without having been made attentive to it, have noticed the close kinship between both series of events. The Hellenic Gnostics who worked out the articles of faith about the Godhead belonged indeed to another environment than the Africans and West-Europeans who later completed the power of the clergy, yet fate has brought it about that the Greeks prepared the way wonderfully for the Romans and the whole Romanized world—which in itself would have been incapable of inventing such subtle thoughts; the more ungraspable the teaching, the more uncontestable the power of the priest. At the risk of committing some repetitions I should like to cast a summarizing backward glance over our expositions: the clarity of what is seen will gain thereby. The first attempt to pour the ungraspable appearance of Jesus of Nazareth into an already current idea and thereby make it comprehensible to oneself and others happened through the Tu es Christus of the Saviour's disciple Peter.

Without doubt it is here first a matter of the purely naïve idea of an impetuous man of the people; the inadequacy of the Jewish Messiah-concept had soon to press itself, however— besides this concept possessed for the heathen, from whose ranks almost all Christians came forth, no clearly imaginable meaning, and so we see already the Apostle Paul with almost adventurous boldness draw in Hellenic ideas in order to set up a new Messiah-ideal. But that also did not suffice the majority: what the Greek revered he had to revere as Godhead, and so Jesus Christ became not alone Son of God but the almighty God himself. Yet see! Scarcely was Jesus Christ revered as God, his manhood began to waver, and therewith for many the historical personality from which the Christian faith had sprung began to fade, if not even to dissolve into a mere appearance: Christianity stood in danger of sinking into one of the many metaphysical delusion-structures of the Hellenic world of thought. From the descriptions in the histories of dogma and of the Church I gain the impression that there was a span of time in which the great majority of Christians—among them not a few of the noblest leading spirits— were outspoken or unconscious "Docetists": so one called (from dokein, to seem) those believers who held the manhood of Jesus Christ in some sense or degree for mere appearance. To those men who recognized this direction as a deadly danger for the Christian religion and threw themselves against it with passion one cannot deny the merit of having saved Christianity—and with it its greatest treasure, the Gospels—from ruin. It did not always go gently; one did not shrink from calling on the help of heathen emperors, and many a worthy man had to flee into the desert before cruel persecution. As concerns the thoughts and the articles of faith, the arbitrary was fought and struck down by the equally arbitrary—only that this latter pursued the purpose of protecting the manhood of Jesus and his historical existence against every questioning. Hereby of course the immediate effect on the then present had to be aimed at, which was not hard for the men concerned, since they themselves had enjoyed the education of their time and all their thinking belonged to the Hellenic cultural circle. To this yet another consideration forces itself upon us: as is known all articles of faith of the Church first arose as defence against "false teachings," and from that it follows that what the Church designates as false teaching has always exercised not insignificant formative influence on its own teaching; so now also Hellenic secret science of God was overcome through Hellenic secret science of God—in the shape of the Trinity- and the God-manhood-doctrine; otherwise the goal would not have been reachable at all. Had the Church judged its human limitation more rightly, it could also as teacher have spread pure blessing; yet it arrogated to itself divine dignity: it, which did not shrink from making the wording of the evangelical fundamental writings serviceable to its purposes through deletions and insertions, it which puts into the mouth of the Saviour words that he never spoke nor could speak (cf. pp. 105 ff. and p. 229), it demands for the wording of its own decisions unalterable validity, and indeed under penalty of eternal damnation: this attempt to assign to something conditioned in many ways, arisen from the need of the moment, unconditional, eternal validity and to bind men for all times to it, means a monstrous act of violence, both against the human mind and against historical truth. The whole Gnosis sprang—as we already remarked above—from a kind of historically conditioned disease of the time and could in no case have held itself long; soon all men marvelled at these madly arbitrary thought-buildings, from which we would now be wholly freed had not the Church claimed eternal validity for its own Gnosticism. So—as punishment of the priestly pride—the blessing turned into a curse. For through the new doctrine of God the Father, of whose immediate nearness Jesus had dwelt on earth to convince men, was pushed into unreachable distances, and not he alone, but with him also the Mediator, our Saviour. Between us and God the priest first shoved the separating forced articles of faith and then still himself and his priest-Church. Cyprian sums up the now Church teaching in few words: "He may not call upon God as his Father who does not acknowledge the Church as his mother" (Unity of the Church, section 6). Hear what Herder says in his writing On the Spirit of Christianity about the priesthood: "The stateChristianity soon departed from the genetic fundamental law (of the freedom and equality of all believers) of the old Christianity, in that after Jewish-heathen manner, more than politically, it separated estates, forbade gifts (of the spirit), restricted gifts.

It separated clergy and laity; a distinction that the original Christianity did not know at all, that was thoroughly contrary to its fundamental constitution, yes that abolished its first idea: for all Christians are chosen ones, a holy people, a royal priesthood, where the least like the greatest should step before God and praise him.—Naturally with this false step all were given" (Ed. of Suphan, 20,89). So Herder, as one sees, makes the idea of the priesthood responsible for the corruption of the Christian religion. That a man of such rare spiritual span, a theologian who mastered the entire specialist knowledge of his time, above all that the most intuitive genius that Germany—and perhaps mankind—ever possessed, moreover a convinced, strong-in-faith Christian, judges the Church in this manner and with this definiteness, must give everyone to think. Me many a layman may suspect of one-sided presentation; Herder he can hold no such scruple against, and Herder judges: if Christianity today no longer possesses conquering power over millions of minds, the guilt lies in the first rank in the formation of the priestly Church—so fateful a "false step" that with it already all further false steps were given and had to follow of themselves therefrom. The name Herder involuntarily awakens that of his great antipode, Immanuel Kant. This one places himself indeed in his book on religion outside all history, on the standpoint of the necessary givennesses of the human mind; all the more weighty are his remarks, and besides Christianity always hovers before his mind and is drawn in as example on every occasion. Kant now gives of the concept of the priest in general the following determination: "Priestcraft is the usurped dominion of the clergy over the minds, in that it gives itself the appearance of being in the exclusive possession of the means of grace" (Religion, 4th piece, general remark). In a section of the same book that bears the entertaining title "On Priestcraft as a Regiment in the After-Service of the Good Principle," he proves that every priestcraft necessarily leads to "a fetish-service," "which is always to be met where not principles of morality, but statutory commands, rules of faith and observances form the foundation and the essential of it… however few the imposed observances may be, enough, if they are declared unconditionally necessary, then that is always a fetish-faith through which the multitude is ruled and through the obedience under a Church (not under the religion) is robbed of its moral freedom." This judgment also —whose detailed grounding one finds in the named work—I recommend to the most earnest attention of my reader, who must consider that the great sage, no less than Herder, had from the house received the complete theological training and had stood on the preacher's pulpit before he ascended the chair of the philosopher: he speaks here of things that he knows thoroughly exactly. With every sentence of Kant one must attend especially exactly to the wording, for the peculiarity of his style consists in the range that he knows how to give to the single word. So he explains in the few words of the first-cited sentence: the essence of the clergy consists in ruling, and indeed in ruling over the minds; therein still no blame would be pronounced; now however comes the questionable: this dominion is founded through an act of violence, in that the Church arrogates to itself privileges that by no means belong to it, and "gives itself the appearance of standing in the exclusive possession" of special "means of grace" conferred on it by God. The intention may be ever so good, an element of deceit—the pia fraus recommended by the Church Fathers—mixes itself in, and it is impossible that this remain without weighty consequences. Therefore it is then said that the Church stands indeed in the service of the good principle—that makes its virtue, at the same time the secret of its power—; yet one cannot help designating this service from a higher standpoint as "after-service," because of that crept-in untruthfulness that clings to the achieved power at the root. That is the same "false step with which all further ones were given," as Herder expressed it—only here more closely designated by Kant. Kant uncovers yet more: through these supposed "means of grace" the priests create in place of the pure confidence in God, as Jesus had taught it, "a fetish-service," which, measured fundamentally and according to its pure moral value, is thoroughly to be equated with every arbitrary fetish-service of primitive men.

On this Kant lays great emphasis and writes: “Between the wholly sensual Vogul who lays the paw of a bear-skin on his head in the morning with the short prayer: ‘do not strike me dead,’ up to the sublimated Puritan and Independent in Connecticut there is indeed a mighty distance in the manner, but not in the principle of believing… The invisible power that commands over the fate of men, to bend it to their advantage, is an intention that they all have; only how that is to be begun, about that they think differently.” That these two men —Kant and Herder—know and acknowledge the uncountable merits of the Church, that understands itself of itself; a great part of these merits lies however outside the proper religion— namely that immediate elevation to God that forms the content of the teaching of Jesus. Purely religiously considered, I would say: by far the greatest merit of the Church—that merit that hallows it for all times—consists (as already earlier remarked) in that it saved the Gospels, and therewith the figure of the Saviour, from ruin and bears them as lasting source of all good in its bosom; the worst of its many faults consists in that it pushed the Mediator—the one who had called: “Come unto me all ye!”—into immeasurable distances and set itself in his place, as mediator of all graces. Hereby it exercised violence on the souls of men—and that avenges itself sooner or later; I say nothing of the terrifying violence that it exercised on life and happiness and goods of countless ones,—as is known Voltaire calculated that the Church has slaughtered more men than fell in all the wars of antiquity, and Kant speaks it openly: “The history of Christianity does it, as concerns the beneficial effect that one may rightly expect of a moral religion, by no means to recommendation” (Religion, p. 195); here however I have merely the torments of conscience and the soul-tortures in mind which the Church at all times and in all its branches has caused, for these all follow with necessity from the “first false step” of which Herder speaks. We have learned the manner how the Church, in order to turn aside destructive errors from itself, used to set up bordering articles of faith which at the same time not seldom meant concessions to the opponent: in this way Judaism received its firm place in the Christian Church. The same happened with many an old heathen piece of faith. Two examples for illustration. Not the Syrians alone, rather all inhabitants of the Mediterranean basin paid for centuries—amidst otherwise changing religious ideas—lasting, special reverence to the Goddess-Mother, the magna Mater; from her they would not by any means depart. Also the Christian communities in Syria—as we have seen in an earlier chapter (p. 199)—demanded ever again a more colourful, more moving heaven, yet especially they could not on the long run do without the magna Mater; she had grown far too much into their heart; various systems of the Christian Gnosis attempted under one or another name to procure her a place near God and his Son. This the Church always knew how to ward off; yet it held it for wise to yield when the Syrians began to speak of Mary—instead of as “Mother of Jesus,” as in the earliest time happened without exception—as “Mother of God.” True, wise bishops warned that the magna Mater hereby again received entrance, and poured out their heart-blood in order to turn this danger away from Christianity. In fact with this new naming Mary loses the whole meaning that the evangelical narrative assigns to her, as mother, not of the God, but of the man Jesus and as the connecting link between Jesus and mankind. To call her “Mother of God” contradicts the article of faith of the triune God. Yet Rome decided otherwise; this centre of the Church has never lost the worldly interest from its eyes and has always known how tightly the bow may be drawn without danger of its breaking. In this case the loss of whole peoples threatened. Thus we learn for example that Sicily remained closed to Christianity for centuries.

There the magna Mater had fused with Isis and was revered in the form of a mother suckling the divine child. When the Church—made wise by its earlier experiences—sent missionaries who brought Maria as Mother of God with the Jesus-child in her arms into the foreground, it at once won the whole population of Sicily: "the heathen opened to Maria, the Mother of God, the temples that they had held closed to Jesus Christ, and confessed themselves defeated"—for as far as the good people understood it, it was merely a matter of slight changes of name: Isis was henceforth to be called Maria and Horus Christ. Le culte de Marie balaya devant lui les débris de paganisme qui couvraient encore l'Europe (see Beugnot, Paganisme, 1, 289 and 2, 270). I personally belong to those who feel the beauty of a worthy Maria-reverence and who have been convinced by experience of its irreplaceability among men of certain races. Only it is impossible to deny that this circle of ideas possesses no point of contact with the doctrine of God and the world-view of Jesus Christ known from the Gospels and springs immediately out of the views of heathendom. A second example of the penetration of unchristian ideas into the Christian Church. The same process always repeats itself anew: on the one side the priestly Church yields in order to lead unbelievers to Jesus Christ; on the other it draws— in order to turn aside the worst abuses—bordering outline-lines, out of which then lasting articles of faith arise. The idea familiar to us from Church doctrine of a general "Last Judgment," in which God, or Jesus Christ, acts as judge and weighs the good and evil deeds of each individual exactly against one another, stands in screaming contradiction to the teaching of Jesus and of his Apostle Paul of redemption through faith. This idea has nothing at all to do with Christianity; rather it is a matter of ancient Egyptian inheritance that was dragged into the Church in its entirety by the heathen. Of such a humanearthly materialism the Saviour's disciple John for example knows nothing: we have seen that according to him the entry into eternal life already takes place here in the temporal (p. 222), and I ask that one look up in Scott's book on the Fourth Gospel, already often cited by me, the detailed proof that John—insofar as he speaks at all of a judgment—understands under it "not a future and dramatic, but a present and inner" one (chap. 10). To the same ancient Egyptian origin goes back the gruesome idea of eternal hell-torments and stems certainly from ages far remote, where culture first began to dawn. Perhaps someone will throw in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, yet we know today, thanks to the discoveries of Grenfell and Hunt, that Luke (who alone brings this narrative) has here interwoven a fable well-known in Egypt; other traits also betray Egyptian influence in this evangelist (see Harnack); besides, earlier theologians had already noticed this piece as an artificial insertion, since it neither links to what immediately precedes nor to what immediately follows and in invention and tone differs markedly from all other parables of the Lord [footnote: The layman must be made attentive to a source of misunderstanding: the word Gehenna, which occurs a few times in the New Testament, is rendered by Luther and others mostly by "hell" or "hellish fire"; true, it designates for the Jews a place of sojourn for great criminals, yet it does not at all correspond to the ancient Egyptian idea of hell and hell-fire familiar to us.]. This Egyptian idea of the punishing hell-fire had long become the common property of all peoples around the Mediterranean region and seems to have suited the average man; characteristic for the early Christians, however, is precisely their rejecting reinterpretation and symbolic conception. Thus for example Origen speaks of the "eternal fire," yet then asks expressly: "What then are we to imagine under this threatened eternal fire?" And he answers this question thus: "The sinner is not cast into a fire that already burns, kindled by another, and that would also flame up without him; rather each one kindles his own fire himself, and the fuel is formed by his own sins" (De Principiis, Book 2, chap. 10, section 4). How exalted the holy man stands above the standpoint of the present-day Jesuits, who force upon every believer "Exercises" that prescribe a sinking into the idea of hell until the person concerned threatens to stifle from the sulphur-stench! So far has the priestly Church brought it in its consistent development! In similar manner all sorts of things—and with time ever more and more—penetrated out of heathendom into Christianity and became, thanks to the rigidifying effect of the Church, a lasting constituent of this religion, which removed it ever further from the religion of Jesus. Harnack writes in his Mission and Expansion of Christianity (3rd ed. 1, 304 ff.):

"Saints and helpers in need, thus halfgods, penetrate into the Church; local cults and local holy places are founded; the regions of life are again distributed to protective spirits; yes, the old gods move in, only with new masks; noisy yearly festivals are celebrated; amulets and sacramentals, relics and holy bones become desirable objects. The religion—once, as strictly spiritual, forbidding and combating every materialization—materializes itself in every respect …." More details on this same subject one finds in Beugnot (2, 261 ff.) and learns how great a part of the Roman divine service was taken over immediately from the mysteryreligions: "the Church did without question its possible, to purify these heathen customs, without however that it ever succeeded in wholly extinguishing the stamp of their origin." We had asked ourselves what influence the ecclesiastical development of Christianity has exercised on the religion of Jesus, as well as on the conception of religion in general (see p. 229)? This question is very hard to answer at the same time shortly, sufficiently and justly, and I must claim the patience of the reader still longer: we come to the ground only gradually. It will further our investigation if we now raise the question of the possibility of a new religious community-formation which would set itself the goal of striving after the very first community and of realizing an unecclesiastical Church. In order to possess the certainty that we understand ourselves exactly, that we know exactly what is to be asked, I send ahead once more two significant utterances of Herder. The first I take from the Ideas toward a Philosophy of History (17th Book, Div. 1, section 5): "With Christianity it was to be, according to the intention of its Founder, nothing less than a ceremonial service, than a Jewish-heathen state-religion, but a pure, free bond of truth and love of man with him (Jesus). Soon however, according to the difference of lands, provinces and times, the after-Christianity mixed itself in such a manner with Jewish and heathen customs that for example the baptism of the innocents became an exorcism of the devil and the memorial meal of a departing friend became the creation of a God, an unbloody sacrifice, a miracle forgiving sins, travel-money into the other world. Unhappily the Christian centuries coincided with ignorance, barbarism and the true epoch of bad taste, so that also into its customs, into the building of its churches, into the arrangement of its festivals, statutes and pomp-institutions, into its songs, prayers and formulas little true, great and noble could come. From land to land, from one world-part to another these ceremonies rolled on; what originally because of an old custom had still some local sense lost the same in foreign regions and times; thus the Christian liturgical spirit became a strange mixture of Jewish-Egyptian-Greek-Roman-barbaric customs, in which often the most serious had to be boring or even ridiculous." This place can pass as a summary of much of what I have set forth above; now I will make my readers acquainted with the second place, in which the prophetic man takes the needs of the present and the hopes of the future into view …. perhaps I say too much with the words "takes into view," for one notices in Herder that the night still surrounds him,—yet he knows, what not everyone knows, that his present in relation to the religion of Jesus is night, and draws from that the confident hope of a coming morning. These expositions I borrow from the precious writing On the Redeemer of Men. According to our three first Gospels (chap. 4, section 12). "That I as a liberated one in the kingdom of Christ live voluntarily-righteous and holy, that is for me the redemption of Christ and the same is it for every man. The ecclesiastical faith by means of this and that formula was the husk in which the fruit, the Gospel itself, grew, the shell that held the kernel fast. We certainly do not throw them away, this husk and shell; we enjoy the fruit and the kernel out of them, yet say nevertheless: they are not themselves kernel and fruit; the ecclesiastical faith, even spun over with the finest dogma, is merely a historical faith. Neither through it, according to its content, nor for its sake, because it is believed, i.e. confessed, was ever a man justified and blessed. The mere Lord-Lordsayers, in whatever manner they say the Lord-Lord, Christ drives away from himself as unknown; He knows only those who do the will of his Father in heaven. The so-called religion to Jesus must therefore with the progress of time necessarily change into a religion of Jesus and indeed unremarked and unhaltingly. His God our God, his Father our Father! From all the speeches of Christ this becomes clear, in that he always sets his own in his place, in trust toward God, in effectiveness, love and hope. Friends were they to him, not servants; branches on him the vine, representatives of his place, brothers whom his Spirit animated.

Everyone who contributes to leading the religion of Jesus back from a meritorious servant-service and painful Lord-Lord-saying to that genuine Gospel of the friend- and brother-disposition, of a free, unconstrained, free, genial participation in the work and purpose of Jesus according to the clear sense of the Gospels, he has himself taken part in the work of Christ and furthered the same." Above all the open free confession on the part of a clergyman must strike us as noteworthy and admirable, who unreservedly admits that a change from the ground up is needful and stands with definiteness to be expected: "The so-called religion to Jesus must therefore with the progress of time necessarily change into a religion of Jesus!" The same conviction to lead to his readers forms the content of this my book. The one thing however I do not grasp: namely how Herder imagines it when he means that this change is to happen "unremarked and unhaltingly"? According to my judgment it rather requires for such an upheaval concerning the depths of the soul-life well-founded conviction and clearly grasped resolution of will. Nothing is harder to shake than ecclesiastical habits and priestly obedience: languages that have been dead for many centuries live on—like the Latin in the Roman and the Old Slovenian in the Serbian Church—like ghosts; demonstrably late fairy-tales—like the designation "Apostolic Creed" for a baptismal confession drawn up in the Gallican Church of the 8th century—sit so immovably firm in the heads even of educated Church-believers that a storm of indignation rushes through Europe when a respected specialist—not attacking this Creed as such—but simply supplements its long-known historical origin through new discoveries and sets it forth in generally graspable language. Everyone who possesses only some modest knowledge knows that many a sentence in this Creed would have been unintelligible to none of the Apostles, still less that it could have an Apostle as author; besides such a one knows that the Church for centuries under the name Apostolic Creed understood the far older confession of the Council of Nicaea (or of Constantinople) and that this designation was transferred only very late to the shorter version; in the silly narrative of the meeting of the twelve Apostles for the common composition of the Symbolum, whereby each single one contributed an article of faith, we possess a genuine monk-legend. All that lies, as said, clearly in the open; whoever however keeps his eyes closed on principle does not see it. This only as example and so that nothing remains unclear. How can one expect that in such heads a change is to go forward unremarked? especially where yet almost the entire clergy of all confessions offers iron resistance? One should only not imagine that the great principle of the Church of the pia fraus possesses no validity more in the 20th century. Here it comes to a right psychological insight, which to ground however causes some embarrassment, because whoever utters such things can be sure in advance of being misinterpreted and degraded by lack of understanding and bad will. A cleverer one would therefore be silent; I however will attempt to communicate to others that which I hold for truth. Every profession stamps upon the man who is lifelong devoted to it a special stamp, imparts to him definitely shaped force and at the same time definite limitations, instills into him good qualities and also bad ones. With no profession does this fall more into the eyes than with the spiritual, which is accustomed to imprint itself so deeply into the whole being that one recognizes a priest or pastor at once even in disguise. No profession has brought forth so many heroes and saints as the spiritual: nobly shaped men are through it as it were loosed from the temporal and already here on earth work sub specie aeternitatis—under the sign of eternity. The sum of self-sacrifice, of devotion in works of mercy, that is daily offered for two thousand years in obedience to the commands of the Christian Saviour, cannot be measured at all, and in this one relation the various branches of the Church stand completely equal among one another. It is lamentable that quite many men seem to have no notion of this and therefore judge unjustly over the spiritual estate, from which further results the inability to bring this one source of the powerful influence of that estate rightly into account. Unfortunately however this profession exercises upon less nobly disposed minds a less favourable influence: it educates them to hypocrites and to power-greedy ones: it is not necessary to execute this more closely here; everyone will be sufficiently instructed through history and experience.

That upon which I wish to direct the attention lies deeper and therefore requires finer observation: this profession—which undertakes to place itself in the service of the highest-truth—influences all—both the nobly and the un-nobly disposed—in a direction that more or less clouds the sense for pure truthfulness. At this fact nothing can be changed; it is a matter of inescapable necessities of the human mind. I would know several causes to name that may be at work here: first, the untrue fundamental assumption that the Church is a creation of God, not of men; second, the forced situation of having lifelong to confess, represent and teach articles of faith that surpass all reason and consequently—rightly considered—are bare of every graspability; third, the obligation in hundreds of questions continually to persuade oneself that one is convinced of things of which one in reality is not convinced, but at best would very gladly be convinced: I think hereby of such cases as when for example a clergyman, according to the liturgical command, must begin the baptismal act with the appeal to Matthew 28, 19, although he knows very well that this verse in the version familiar to us cannot be genuine and is demonstrably not genuine (see pp. 105 ff.). For the conscience there may be many excuses, such as for example the uncertainty of all text-questions, further the more than thousand-year usage, also the shyness before disturbing the layman, and especially the longing wish that it might—despite the crushing counter-proofs— nevertheless agree—which all brings every clergyman, even with a disposition upright from the house, into a skewed position toward truthfulness. This only as indication and as stimulation to own observing and thinking. What I wish to make feelable is that into all things that go out from the Church—from the greatest to the smallest—an admixture of pia fraus is accustomed to mix itself in: that makes attack as well as understanding uncommonly difficult. One has to do with an opponent who always slides through one's hands; not without cause has Goethe spoken the words: Immortal is the priests' cunning! It comes however to understanding that the intentions leading hereby are to be estimated as far more dangerous when they germinate in pure, high souls and the "cunning" works unconsciously than when cunning deceit is at work. One does well to confess to oneself from the outset that it will always remain very hard to come up against the "priests" and their work—against the good and the worked good, because they are good, and against the bad and the bad, because they are bad. Therefore we have from the Church—so I mean—no change such as Herder hopes for to expect; just as little may we flatter ourselves ever to convince the clergy and their believers through ever so weighty grounds. Only those come into consideration whose longing drives them to Jesus and who find in the existing churches no home for their souls; whereas it amounts to a crime to startle those who have found peace in their church: what one takes from them one knows, how much they are capable of taking up of a purer faith cannot be calculated in advance. We have the example of the Saviour before our eyes, who left each one quietly with his religious customs. True it is unavoidable that religions that stand on the same stage of spiritual culture combat one another openly or secretly; the religion of Jesus however stands higher than all others and therefore does not feel itself as in conflict with them. Yet now it is necessary to hold a powerful affirmation complementary against this series of negations. Even if we renounce, as said, every combat, I am nevertheless firmly convinced that only an organized community-formation is able to come up against the unavoidable resistance of the churches and that every attempt to call a religious community into life without organization will remain stillborn from the outset. It would come to grasping again the idea of a Christian community at its root, as the organ of all practical relations and connections, as the mediation toward the side of the world, not as the representative of God. The oldest community went before us, as said, with the example; duty would be to surpass it in regard to extent and articulated structure of the work of mercy: whoever does not make earnest here does not mean it earnest either with the kingdom of God. If we wished to paint out this field of activity more closely, we would easily fall into play; yet every future remains always hidden to man; what is rightly taken in hand builds itself further and out of itself. For the present it suffices if we know that the first and properly fundamental, every further shaping determining task of the new community will sound: with all forces serve the work of love!

This decisive affirmation, bound with the equally decisive negation of all priesthood and of all subjection under forced articles of faith, already suffices to mediate the clear idea of a new shape. Yet once more let it be repeated—for this quality possesses decisive meaning: to the essence of the new community would belong to be a "peace-community" that leads no combat of any kind against the existing churches and sects, whose gates rather stand open to all, also without that the exit from their churches is demanded of them: everyone who confesses that Jesus is the mediator between man and God would have to be welcome,—may he otherwise believe what character and education have made a need for him. So alone can the true following of Jesus Christ act! And in that it embraces all Christians with equal love, it will with time succeed in extinguishing the contrasts and founding unity in Jesus. If we now ask after the further field of activity of the community-elders, I know only one single office to name, yet an office that requires a highest measure of judgment-force, of experience and of delicacy: I mean that to which Paul dedicates chapters 11–14 of the First Letter to the Corinthians, closing with the words: "When you come together …. let all things be done with propriety and in order." For there can be no question that the new community also will arrange solemn gatherings: true not under the idea of serving God thereby, thus of celebrating a "divine service" with it, but rather in order to serve men through soul-elevating devotion. True through Jesus the root of all religion is sunk into the heart of the individual and he as the first taught: "When you pray, go into your chamber and shut your door and pray to your Father who is in the secret …." (Matt. 6, 6)—a direction that in the history of mankind had never yet been heard and that forms a turning-point in the history of religion; nevertheless the Saviour spoke on another occasion: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18, 20). In truth religion strives from of old in all its various shapes after commonality, and one may assert that it belongs to its essence to bind men through a strong band of common conviction inseparably with one another. There have been times—and they still exist for certain peoples today—where this even formed their only moral content. Christianity has indeed shifted the axis and thereby conferred upon the individual a dignity earlier unknown, yet, rightly considered, through this circumstance the commonality even gains in value: religions whose peculiarity brings it with it that they play themselves wholly in publicity form a firm yet superficial cement, whereas there where men who adore God in the solitude of the closed little chamber step together to common confession, an unequally more intimate, content-richer and more powerful community forms and builds itself up. Therefore never was a community of so powerful effect as the Christian—which already showed itself in the time of the first martyrs. There may well be single specially disposed ones to whom solitude suits and who are furthered by it, yet in general it is with religion just as with art: through common experiencing the receptivity of the souls is enormously heightened, and what otherwise at best would have remained pale presentiment grows suddenly up to an experience determining the whole future. Here even—of that I am convinced—still undreamed possibilities of effect slumber; for the priestchurches have let much rigidify through the eternal sameness and have buried other things by bidding the inner vocation be silent and assigning the word alone to the outer vocation. Paul had taught:

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (2 Cor. 3, 17), and at the place partially cited earlier he says: "When you come together, let each bring something, a psalm, a teaching, a revelation, a tongue, an interpretation. Yet all is to serve for edification," and he expressly adds: "You may all prophesy one after another, so that all may learn and be admonished." This recommendation the priests have thoroughly made an end of—already through the mere distinction into a spiritual estate and into a lay estate. In the new community it will have to be proceeded fundamentally otherwise. As the Apostle indicates here, it comes to letting every God-given force come to full unfolding: to the one is given the gift of inspired speech, to the other that of the deep devotion-mood of prayer; each is to bring and dedicate to the generality what is his own.

In this connection I should like to point to a precious experience from my early youth that confers upon me the full certainty that I grasp here not after fantasies but after realities. In the sixties of the past century there lived in Versailles as venerable head of a known Huguenot family a significant woman, Madame André, whose name was soon thereafter also often named in Germany, thanks to the circumstance that the German Crown Prince during the siege of Paris had taken lodging in her beautiful property, Les Ombrages. Madame André—who placed her energy undivided in the service of mercy— had now, despite the customary dogmatic limitation, unconsciously taken a great step in the direction desired by Herder, namely out of the religion to Jesus into the religion of Jesus. With her all Sundays in the afternoon free gatherings took place, for the elevation of the souls to God through Jesus Christ. Sometimes clergymen took the word, and I have heard famous preachers there; more lasting impression however made upon me—for they awakened more understanding in my childlike heart—the addresses of Madame André herself, as well as of a number of laymen who, sometimes from own impulse, sometimes requested by the house-wife, in very various style instituted sermon-like considerations which mostly closed in gripping prayer-devotions. Later I once inhabited for several weeks a little house within the park of Les Ombrages and took frequently part in the house-devotions that were held daily early and evening; nothing unctuous, tearful, threatening have I ever heard there: a short, fresh song, a short reading from the Gospels and for conclusion a short, improvised devotion. The leadership of these heart-strengthening, common soul-elevations came in turn to every house-companion: once a family-member managed, another time the coachman or one of the gardeners or a chamber-servant. Never have I experienced a false tone: if it fell hard to one to master the language, he made it all the shorter; if one found no further, Madame André sprang in for him. Precisely from the mouth of the unpractised I remember having heard unexpected and thereby impressive turns—especially drastic images. Hereby another youth-memory rises in me. In Versailles we maintained relations to a professor of history at the Collège de France, Rosseuw Saint-Hilaire, in the learned world through his extensive History of Spain—his life-work—most honourably known. This excellent man was born and educated as Catholic and only late in life, under the impression of a great soul-shock, passed over to Protestantism. Already here on earth he lived in the kingdom of the Father and outside his professional activity he knew no other goal than the religious; especially the hope filled him to see his French fatherland rescued through the separation from Rome out of the otherwise unavoidable moral decline. When once a case of mourning had struck our family, he appeared about fourteen days long every evening with us at the hour when he knew the family-members gathered, first knotted a conversation with this one and that one, out of which then gradually a coherent presentation and elucidation of some point from the life and teachings of Jesus Christ arose, whereby he especially was also accustomed to draw in the Apostle Paul; with incomparable art he understood it, gradually to lead over from the elucidating presentation into the devotion and to lead his hearers—to whom such thought-courses had until then lain far—on this way into mystical depths where one felt God's presence immediately and sank with the inspired one upon the knees. Should someone object that my examples relate to Frenchmen, and with these the gift of speech occurs more frequently than with the Germans, I could indeed not deny this, yet I would hold against it the greater depth of mind and the richer education that are widely spread among the countrymen of Eckhart, Tauler, Luther and Jakob Böhme. It is my intimate conviction that here—besides the faith—it comes uniquely to the daring; I trust unconditionally the word of the Saviour: "Take no thought how or what you shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaks in you" (Matt. 10, 19 ff.). When "the Spirit of the Father" comes to word in it, then—that no one certainly denies—the highest thinkable goal of this community will be reached in the effect toward the inward. Thereby is however not said that this community in Jesus Christ will not also—besides to the devotion-speech—grasp at other means to elevate the souls of men God-ward.

Whether thereby use will be made of the symbolic actions borrowed from the mystery-religions, familiar to us under the Latin designation sacraments, seems to me questionable; that lets itself hard unify with the spirit of the teaching of Jesus so wholly loosed from all earthly ideas. The baptism, if it, as was the case in early Christianity, is performed on adults, certainly offers the most beautiful symbol that at the same time speaks to the eyes and to the heart: and yet it must make us thoughtful when we learn that Jesus himself was not accustomed to baptize (John 4, 2), and that also Paul avoided it as far as possible (1 Cor. 1, 17). Every solemn custom becoming habit harbours in itself the danger of seeing feelings transform themselves into things and images, into magical forced means: the devil of materialization lurks at all corners upon us men. Herder seems indeed to have hoped for the revival of the love-meal in a new shaping, and one grasps that as soon as one possesses a lively idea of the earliest, so to speak pre-ecclesiastical love-meal, of which Harnack gives the following fine description: "Such a celebration in its sublimity and consecration, its brotherliness and many-sidedness hardly any other cult had to show. Every feeling and every spiritual need found here its nourishment. The combination of prayer, song, scripture-reading and sermon was formed after the synagogue divine service and must already have made the deepest impression upon the heathen; but in that the celebration of the Lord's Supper was added to it, an action was introduced that, simple as it was, could be considered and has been considered under the most various points of view. It was a mysterious, divine gift of knowledge and of eternal life; it served for the forgiveness of sins; it was a thanksgiving, it was a sacrifice, it was a making-present of the death of Christ, it was a love-meal of brotherliness and a band of unity, it was a support of the hungry and needy: it was a pre-presentation and a pledge of the heavenly meal. More can an action hardly be …." (Mission and Expansion of Christianity, 3rd ed., 1, 420). Herder now knows well that it is impossible to call the past again into life, for it could already then maintain itself only for a short time; yet he dreams of breathing new life into this solemn action through new interpretation. He is namely of the opinion that hitherto no one has rightly understood the sense of the symbolic action of the Saviour at the last meal with his disciples: "no doctrinal opinion has wished to notice the connection of both symbols (of the breaking of the bread and of the handing-round of the cup), upon which yet all depends, or developed its sense." Already in the second chapter of this book (p. 64) we learned the conception of the very first Christians: for them the agape meant merely a thank-offering; at the bread the community spoke: "We thank thee, Father, for the life and the knowledge that thou hast made known to us through thy servant Jesus; to thee be glory for ever!" and similarly at the cup. That reminds of the words of Christ as Paul reports them: "This do in remembrance of me,"—yet goes no stroke beyond that. Yet the luxuriantly blooming mystery-religions with their sacramental agapes and their doctrine of the change exercised too powerful an influence for it to have been able to remain long with that conception—for their lovemeals play immediately into the letters of Paul (see 1 Cor., chap. 10). And so we heard already Ignatius speak of the bread and the wine as a "magic means of immortality" (pharmakon athanasias) (p. 64). From this idea—yes from this whole circle of ideas—the Church could never more free itself. True still in the 3rd century the mighty Origen taught that the expression "body of Christ" is to be understood only figuratively, and "the image holds only for the simple," since in truth the communication takes place only from spirit to spirit. "Neither do we lack through the not-eating of the bread consecrated through prayer in and for itself anything, nor do we have through the mere eating in and for itself anything more, but the cause of that which one has less is the bad, and the cause of that which one has more is the good disposition of each one. The earthly bread in and for itself is not different from all other foods" (after Neander: General History of the Christian Religion and Church, 4th ed., 2, 405 ff.). Herder now means that the double-symbol that the Saviour had in mind was from the beginning first imperfectly understood and later wholly misinterpreted; his own conception the following words bring to expression:

"The bread of mourning in one hand, in the other the cup of courage, of joy, the Lord's Supper founds an active covenant-community whose symbol it itself is." For nearer grounding Herder still executes much that one may look up on the spot; I content myself with the communication of the third section of the relevant exposition (On the Difference between Religion and Doctrinal Opinions in Regard to the Symbolic Customs of Christianity, II On the Lord's Supper): "In a symbolic action it itself—the action—must speak, and the whole accompanying speech must interpret it. Here Christ broke the dry bread; this indicated: so would his body be despised and cruelly broken. He handed the cup round, and since he could neither indicate nor wished a pouring-out of the blood, but as house-father handed the cup round, so the formula also changes here accordingly. 'This cup is the thank—and joy-cup—for a new constitution that will bloom up through my death. Think thereon; think of me!' (Luke 22, 20; 1 Cor. 11, 25; Matt. 26, 28).

A doctrinal opinion therefore that tears both parts of the action from one another and leaves out the one, the most significant, has destroyed the whole symbol. No doctrinal opinion has wished to notice the connection of both symbols, upon which yet all depends, or developed its sense. Each lets Christ tautologically repeat an idea; and yet precisely the contrast of both was the speaking sense of the symbol. No doctrinal opinion has applied distress and joy, innocent death and new animation as the corresponding main parts of the symbol, under the dry bread and the cup of joy, or designated them as the main points of the comparison. Without the second symbol the first said merely apparent downfall, nearness of a shameful death, yet not its joyful fruits; and these preferentially to indicate was precisely Christ's intention" [footnote: For the easing of the reader I have transposed two lines, taken over some sentences from the first version and translated two unaccustomed foreign words]. Through this conception of Herder the sacramental interpretation of a magical communication of divine substance to the man is excluded; to the material all value is in general denied and this is found alone in the action. Therefore from the standpoint of a Jesus-religion nothing would be to object against such a celebration.

Only there still remained always the above-mentioned scruples: the inclination of man to take up parables as material realities works—that his whole history witnesses—all too powerfully for the greatest caution not to appear commanded to idealism. To most of my readers Goethe's utterance in the seventh book of Poetry and Truth will be familiar, in which he knows to make to the Catholic Church doctrine, so far as the sacraments come into consideration, the only reproach that it does not know enough sacraments; the said utterance one finds cited everywhere, yet the more attentive one can learn at this place—just as at a thousand others—that, in order to understand Goethe, one must dwell longer with every subject: Goethe is accustomed to take a question into view from the most various sides, and what he beholds from each new standpoint he communicates with purest clarity and uprightness, without concerning himself in the least about how far the various judgments will logically agree with one another. Therefore composure belongs to interpreting him rightly. Here for example—as so often with him—there lies a certain ironical underlining, for the purpose of more striking making-visible of unusual insights, in the indication that the Protestant has "too few" and the Catholic still not enough sacraments: the whole serves to prepare a deeper insight, namely the insight of the highest ideal of all religion. This would first be reached when every action, every occurrence in life is felt and interpreted as dedicated to God, thus the life as "a great general sacrament!"—the being-God's-own as the inexpressible mystery of life. Goethe does not speak that out clip and clear, yet we have herein again to admire a at once tender and deep stylistic intention: for such a mystical insight does not suit for dry words, therefore a Goethe avoids speaking it out and contents himself with tender indications. Whoever wishes to hear the same insight spoken out round and robust and at the same time with captivating grace, let him look up in Martin Luther's Church Postil the sermon on the fifth Sunday after Epiphany (Epistles): "Be it eating, drinking, sleeping, waking, going, standing, speaking, being silent, working, being idle etc., is all pure costly thing, because it all goes in the name of the Lord Jesus."

And then let him open the Taittiriyaka-Upanishad (3, 10) and let himself be instructed by the Indian wise man that the knowing one recognizes and reveres God in speaking, in inhaling and in exhaling, in every work which the hands perform, in every step that the feet take back, yes, in all bodily performances! [footnote: In the rendering of this place I follow Max Müller, who here translates more clearly for us Europeans than Paul Deussen. Fundamentally the sense is the same with both.] The slightest consideration suffices to convince that with such a conception—which transforms the whole life into a single "great general sacrament" (as Goethe demanded)—the single priest-sacraments lose all meaning and must as meaningless necessarily vanish. This concept of the general sacrament abolishes in general that of a priesthood opposed to the laity, in that every man—if one still wishes to speak of "priest" at all—must be his own priest,—and this again agrees exactly with the ideas of the first Christianity that revived in Luther (see: On the Freedom of a Christian Man). Herewith I hope to have made clear why we may doubt of the elevation of symbolic actions to lasting institutions within the new community of Jesus. The judgment will turn out otherwise as soon as the co-operation of art is spoken of. The great German poets in words and in tones have a trait in common that distinguishes them from other poets and unites them—despite all that otherwise separates them from one another—into a family: their high concept of the dignity of art. Most among them have left more or less detailed utterances hereupon, and where this is not the case we can take it from their works. In this relation the imperial court-poet Walter von der Vogelweide reaches the hand to the sturdy schoolman steeped in Latin ideals, to the Teutonic man of the people Hans Sachs, and likewise Martin Opitz, Klopstock. Among all however two distinguish themselves through the passionate enduring devotion to this thought, of whose decisive meaning for the weal of mankind they both are equally penetrated: Friedrich Schiller and Richard Wagner. Schiller's attention remained preferably directed upon that point that one can name the root-point of this consideration, namely upon the becoming-man of the man through the awakening of the free forming-drive: to this thought he dedicates the most perfect of his writings, Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man; Wagner, who confessed himself to the same teaching, found himself toward the close of his life occasioned to direct his thinking with fervour upon the summitpoint of the same consideration, namely upon the organic relations between religion and art, which he set forth with artistic illuminating-force and captivating conviction-power in a series of essays. Until the present day these two decisive thought-deeds have not by far found the attention that would belong to them; the minds of men were filled with other things and went unreceivable past these masterperformances. It comes in addition that Schiller indeed reaches crystalline purity of the thoughtexpression in this writing, yet—precisely hereby, in that namely word and thought cover each other exactly and the customary more of words falls away—demands the most tense attention of his reader in order to be understood; whoever does not give himself wholly to him will not become partaker of his instruction. With Wagner no such hindrance lies; to him stands in the way the general German prejudice against writings that have "musicians" as author—they remain unread. The need of the present will already point the men to these two path-breakers. Schiller's main teaching-sentence lets itself be summarized in his own words: "Nature has only creatures, art has made men …. Nature begins with the man no better than with her remaining works: she acts for him where he as free intelligence cannot yet himself act. But precisely that makes him into man, that he does not stand still at that which mere nature made out of him, but possesses the capacity …. to transform the work of necessity into a work of his free choice …." (Letter 2 and 3). "What is the man before beauty entices the free pleasure from him and the quiet form soothes the wild life? Eternally uniform in his purposes, eternally changing in his judgments, selfish without being himself, unbound without being free, slave without serving a rule" (Letter 24). "The aesthetic culture"—the sense for the beautiful—is it whereby the man obtains freedom and that means "freedom to be what he shall be" (Letter 21). Neither is it possible at this place to go into Schiller's special determinations of the concepts "play," "play-drive," "semblance," "beautiful semblance," "pure semblance" etc., that would lead us too far from our way, nor can we enter into his expositions on society and state—to which the greatest part of the writing is dedicated—; rather it comes to us here upon the scattered hints that always again point to a combat in

the man's inward between a dignity that Schiller estimates so high that he can write: "the disposition to the Godhead the man carries uncontradictably in his personality in himself" (Letter 11), and an inability to tear himself lastingly loose from the animalness, whose cause he beholds in a certain "something" inborn in the man: "what stands in the way of the taking-up of the truth, even when it shone ever so brightly, and of the acceptance of the same, even when it convinced ever so livingly" (Letter 8). This insight leads with necessity to thoughts and strivings that we are entitled to designate as "religious," even though Schiller—who does not overstep the self-set bounds—only seldom speaks the word religion. A main insight finds expression in the following words: "The enlightenment of the understanding …. shows in the whole so little a ennobling influence upon the dispositions that it rather fixes the corruption through maxims" (Letter 5), and further: "not enough therefore that all enlightenment of the understanding only insofar deserves respect as it flows back upon the character; it goes also in a certain measure out from the character, because the way to the head must be opened through the heart. Cultivation of the feeling-capacity is therefore the more urgent need of the time …." (Letter 8). Such insights upon the decisive meaning of the heart—in contrast to the understanding—for the culture of mankind and upon the necessity of a fundamental cultivation of the feeling-capacity witness of deep Christian inspiration. Schiller also expressly confesses that our "barbaric stateconstitutions" are incapable of contributing to the striven goal; that can uniquely "an instrument" perform "which the state does not give," and "sources must be opened that maintain themselves pure and pure with all political corruption." Schiller continues indeed then: "this instrument is the beautiful art, these sources open themselves in its immortal patterns" (Letter 9); yet he sets in the glorious ninth letter so exalted a concept of art and of the creating artist that uniquely the word "religion" is still lacking. That the lacking of this word means a lack shall not be denied: precisely at this point now Richard Wagner intervenes, in that he carries the question over out of the region of pure thinking into that of feeling and of experience. If Schiller writes: "Mankind has lost its dignity, but art has rescued and preserved it …," so Wagner knows that this lost dignity constituted the religious element in the man and that the rescue can succeed uniquely to a religious art: "I was allowed to recognize to true art an all the higher vocation as I found it with true religion perfectly one" (Collected Writings, 1st ed. 10, 332). At a further place it then says: "Yet the highest art cannot grow the force to such revelation if it lacks the foundation of the religious symbol of a most perfect moral world-order …." (10, 335). The existence of purest art is conditioned precisely through the existence of pure religion: uniquely to this soil can such an art spring up, and uniquely in the service of the religious life is it able to maintain itself pure: "its true task art fulfills" first in that it "through ideal presentation of the allegorical image leads to the grasping of the inner kernel of the same, the inexpressible divine truth" (10, 275). Closest organic relations of mutual giving and taking exist accordingly between religion and art: if religion forms the atmosphere in which alone such an art can bloom up, so can religion on the long run not do without art. For this is reserved to art, where religion becomes artificial, to rescue the kernel of religion, in that it (the art) grasps the mythical symbols, which the Church wishes to have believed as true in the proper sense, according to their figurative value, in order through ideal presentation of these mythical symbols to let the deep truth hidden in them be recognized. So the Bayreuth master assigns to art a twofold office: in the "times of terrible aberrations"—to which we must reckon our present—it takes over the task of rescuing the kernel of religion and thereby of pointing us the way to religious rebirth; yet when first the day has come where our culture deserves to be called a religious one, then art itself will be recognized as religious act—and among the arts foremost "the sounding soul of the Christian religion, the holy music." Even if this sketch of the teachings of Schiller and of Wagner had to turn out fleeting, it will have sufficed to give the uninformed an idea of the high concept that German poets formed of the dignity of their art, and to show him that they assigned to this art precisely an exalted office in the more perfect becoming-man of the man.

Of the holy earnest of such men none may doubt; they do not speak into the empty; precisely these works arose with both in the solemn mood of the approaching close of life; both gave the best and highest that had resulted for them out of their creating, working-out and experiencing, to their fellow-men for weal. And we should, as hitherto, also further leave such things unconsidered!? Schiller knew exactly that these strivings had no attention to expect from the present surrounding him, and admonishes the like-minded not to despair: "Give the world upon which you work the direction to the good, so will the quiet rhythm of time bring the development." What must appear suited already today to shape our trust in the German poets in words and in tones living and unshakable is that these men have already set up a stately series of mighty works, born wholly and entirely out of the spirit of Christian religion; uniquely our understanding is lacking in order already today to introduce them as the most impressive and effective constituents of solemn Goddevotions. Wagner speaks of Beethoven and of Bach and says of their works: "Beyond all thinkability of the concept the tone-poetical seer reveals to us the inexpressible: we divine, yes we feel and see it, that also this world of the will that seems inescapable is only a state, passing away before the one: I know that my Redeemer lives!" (10, 321). In truth works like Bach's Passions and Cantatas float nowadays like ghosts in the air around, without a true home-place: their performance in the concert-hall has for every feeling mind something blasphemous; yet if one brings them to hearing in the church, then the house of God lowered as it were to a concert-hall becomes moodless or at least mood-poor; in truth the content of these exalted creations demands the taking-up as organic constituents into fervent religious actions of a community united through faith. The same holds of quite many works of Beethoven, which in the unexampled force of the devotion—be it to prayer, be it to despair, or again to joy—truly find themselves as concert-program-number in a false place and which would first reveal the whole heavenly treasure of their content when they—as holiest products of the human spirit—will have been fitted into the frame of a religious action. Never has a church-art succeeded in so jubilantly unshakable a confession as the all-song: Brothers—above the starry tent Must a dear Father dwell! True it is characteristic for the peculiarity precisely of this poet that many of his most divine inspirations, as they go forth out of a wholly solitary soul, turn themselves likewise to the solitude of the closed chamber: a formation like the Canzona di ringraziamento offerta alla divinità one hears properly first then rightly when it suddenly lives up before the inner ear in the silence of a sleepless night-hour. The decisive step to the marriage of art with religion did however first Richard Wagner, whose stageworks all—as has already often been remarked—stand in some relation to the thought of redemption. We know from the second chapter that at the time of the earth-wandering of Jesus Christ the thought of the redemption (soteria) already stood in the mid-point of various widely spread religions; this idea however remained the expression for a mere longing until it received through the life and dying of our Saviour a content that at the same time gave it bodily reality and world-overcoming transfiguration. Under both shapes we meet the idea in Wagner's stage-works: in the ones as mere consuming longing that never leads to the goal, in the others as all-conquering Christian faith. If I named only the thought of redemption, I now add that this—where it appears Christian—cannot at all be brought to presentation without the accompanying Christian conceptions of faith, grace, love, hoping, renouncing, sacrificing. Let us grasp at once for the example. If one sets aside the words of the Saviour, I would know nothing at all to name that would lend to the for the understanding hard-graspable fact of the divine grace so immediately visible and convincing expression as the closing scene of Tannhäuser, where the hero sinks lifeless at the bier of Elisabeth and in the same moment the train of the younger pilgrims hurries near: Hail! Hail! The wonder of grace Hail! and announces that the sinner, to whom the hardest exercises of repentance and penance had availed nothing and for whom the Church knew no healing-means more, has yet found grace before God: High above all world is God, and his mercy is no mockery!

Whoever has become partaker of the fortune to experience the great work as drama—not as opera—knows that at the named place the entire audience was overwhelmed by tears: the impression surpasses all description. This impression is not alone—and not mainly—to be ascribed to the gripping stagepicture, the gripping word-poetry and the gripping tone-painting, but rather to the effect of the whole action culminating in that last scene, which here issues into the revelation of the divine grace. It would not be enough if one wished to say: that is Christian art; here we have the immediate presentation of the religion of Jesus as we learned it in the third chapter of the present book (pp. 124 ff.), and indeed it takes place with such unheard-of conviction-force that certainly quite many a man has under this impression been transformed into a Christian. Related things could be executed about the great brother-work Lohengrin, in which especially the idea of the kingdom of God on earth, as Jesus had taught it (pp. 99 ff.), has through the wonderful interlocking of the word- and the tone-poetry reached expression with perfect clarity: how this kingdom grows up around the man—like a tree in which the birds of heaven nest and sing—protecting him from all evil of the world so long as he only believes; how however, as soon as he doubtingly "looks back" and seeks to explain the inexplicable to himself, the sheltering kingdom dissolves and vanishes: all these mysteries are communicated un-misunderstandably to the feeling and work like a new parable of the teaching of our Saviour. Other works of the same master apply, as already indicated above, to the presentation of the longing for redemption outside the Christian faith in the wonder-working mediator and therefore lead to a negation opposed to the Christian affirmation—an indispensable supplement for the conscious grasping of the teaching of Jesus. Then however Wagner took the decisive step and consecrated through Parsifal the dramatic art to the service of religion: he attached to it the prohibition ever to perform this work on a theatre, since that would amount to a blasphemy. Parsifal is much richer in allegory and symbolism than Tannhäuser and Lohengrin; here meaning lies enclosed in meaning and secret-ed in: for it comes to letting the inexpressible sound in the soul. Only so much be said: in the mid-point stands the intention to let "the God's-complaint," which fills the whole world yet remains unheard by deaf human ears, sound so shatteringly in all souls that they must cry out with Parsifal: The Saviour's complaint there I perceive, The complaint, ah! the complaint About the desecrated sanctuary! In every human mind lies such a sanctuary; every man is—according to Jesus' teaching—a son of God and is as such called into the kingdom of God: this to proclaim, the Saviour wandered two thousand years ago on earth… And how does the world surrounding us look! How have we men repaid the Saviour his love and his suffering!

….. To the deepest depths of religious mysticism the master—supported upon the co-operation of the ars christian-issima—dares to lead us down, up to the compassion with the compassionate and up to the Highest salvation's wonder: Redemption to the Redeemer! Such a work belongs plainly wholly and entirely into the region of religion and should be performed exclusively in the service of the religious conviction to which it owes its arising; the slightest addition of theatrical essence and non-essence must work injuriously upon the receiver and at the same time annihilates the God-fearing intention of the word-tone-poet. The question that we posed to ourselves at the beginning of this section after the co-operation of art in the frame of the new Jesus-community finds itself answered thus, that the most gifted and highestminded German men have not merely taught this co-operation, but that they have already given us a stately series of very various works and master-works that belong here and form the beginnings of a true "art of the future,"—namely an art that we of today already enjoy, yet whose capacity of effect in a surrounding suited to it we are hardly able to pre-divine.

Special value in regard to this new religion-art comes to the investigations of Leopold von Schroeder, which he has summarized in his two writings: Mystery and Mime in the Rigveda (1908) and The Completion of the Aryan Mystery in Bayreuth (1911). Here it is proved that with the Aryan Indians in the oldest time it was custom to lead the most significant myths as action before the eyes, that is thus dramatically, and that these performances formed a most important part of the religious festivals, in that —most probably—magica effectiveness was ascribed to them. Similar has meanwhile been shown for the old Germans and for other peoples from the same tribal kinship. The present striving of purest German art would thus mean a return on a higher stage to age-old sanctified custom.

One fact still remained unmentioned that is suited to strengthen our trust in Richard Wagner and in his religious art: as Schroeder shows, all his fundamental motives are not merely—what was already known—of old-German origin, but they go back to the most ancient ground-stock of Aryan poetry, whereby especially the following circumstance deserves emphasis: through the extreme simplification of every action carried through by Wagner in the interest of the word-tone-drama the poet—wholly unconsciously—has effected the restoration - "of the simplicity of the old Aryan mystery, which offered only a few scenes …. with much significant, all-saying, to all immediately understandable content" (The Completion etc., p. 207). This holds of the "dragon-thrust," followed by the maiden-awakening, of the gold-hoard and the curse adhering to it, of the Venus-mountain and the redemption of the sinner, of the "swan-life" and the God-sent knight, of the heavenly vessel and the weapon that alone heals the wound that it itself has struck etc. The unthinkable richness of the symbolism of youthful races celebrates here a new birth and confers upon these works inexhaustible truth-content. With few words yet a fundamentally most important consideration must be brought forward: the artistic presentation of religious truths works necessarily against the rigidifying into forced articles of faith; thereto comes the immeasurable effect of the music, which excludes every understanding-content and therewith all dogmatics from itself. Thus we possess for example in Franz Liszt's enchanting Saint Elisabeth a work that goes forth out of outspoken Roman-Catholic convictions; the tone-poetry however dissolves all Church teachings, and uniquely the pure "Jesus-religion," the religion of the "Father of love," reaches presentation. About the co-operation of art in the service of religion there would still be very much to say, for all arts can take part in the work, yet I have believed myself allowed to limit myself here to the most important, which without question forms the drama born out of the spirit of music. This places now in its combination of the sense of sight with the sense of hearing an incomparable organ at the disposal of religion: a making-visible of deepest mystical presentiments, an overcoming of the inadequacies of language. Philosophical theories about the essence of music are not the matter at this place; it may suffice here the appeal to a man to whom all such theorizing lay far: Goethe judges of the first many-voiced a capella song, "it speaks to the deepest best sense of the man and lets him feel his God-likeness livingly" (Apprenticeship Years, 6th Book). On the other hand he ascribes to the eye the capacity to "lure us near to the threshold where we may look into the splendour of the Godhead without going blind" (Natural Writings, W. A. 8, 334). One imagine now what a handle a work of art that harmoniously melts both artistic senses with one another and lets them heighten each other mutually offers to the poet for the leading near up close to the Godhead! That we have to understand the two words of Goethe just cited figuratively lies in the open, yet they stimulate to an insight that possesses enormous meaning for religion and that is (seldom or never gained: the immediate life-activity—as this takes place through the senses of the eye and of the ear—is rather suited to lead us "to the threshold" of the Godhead than the understanding with its circumstantialities and than the reason with its dreamings. Here it comes to a right, clear distinction that succeeds for the nature-man without further consideration, while it causes the educated some trouble, because all education generates a certain nature-removing artificiality that is again overcome only through a reflection —which deserves to be called "culture." True both capacities—sensibility and understanding—are able nothing without one another, a fact to which Kant has given expression in the lapidary sentence: "Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind"—words whose exact sense is made unmisunderstandable through the following sentences: "Without sensibility no object would be given to us and without understanding none would be thought. Therefore it is just as necessary to make one's concepts sensible (i.e. to add to them the object in the intuition) as to make one's intuitions understandable (i.e. to bring them under concepts)" (Pure Reason, p. 75). To understand this one needs not to be a philosopher: a bit of good will and a few moments of reflection suffice. Now however inborn dispositions of the human mind effect that we always correspond to the one half of the above admonition, yet to the other quite frequently not: our intuitions we always make understandable to ourselves, whereas we love to think without that to our concepts intuitions of objects were "added," that is corresponded, or we content ourselves with so blurred objects that these, as soon as we fix them firmly into the eye, dissolve into mist.

To the sense-intuitions the concepts needful for their clarification join themselves of themselves—no matter whether these are right or false—if that did not happen, no conscious perception at all would take place; whereas it lets itself be very comfortably dealt with empty-of-content thoughts, to which then the reason attaches and erects buildings that carry all appearance of consistency upon themselves, in reality however are mere air-formations.

This holds especially of the thought "God," with which we are wholly unable to add any "object in the intuition," wherefore the thought—as thought—remains empty. This was already mentioned in the first chapter with appeal to Kant, who has proved that it is impossible to attach to the thought-shape "God" any single determining property "at which one could not uncontradictably demonstrate that, when one separates from it all the anthropomorphistic (suited to the human spirit), only the mere word remains over for us, without being able to connect the least concept with it …." (Practical Reason, 1, 2, 2, VII). It would mean to misunderstand Kant if one wished to take up his words as if he recommended us not to think at all about the Godhead: he wishes only to prevent that we hold our thoughts for knowledge; rather we are to remain conscious that with them we grope about in the dark. Now however I first arrive at the insight that lies at my heart to communicate; the negation is to be followed by an affirmation, and that happens best in that we take to Kant's word Goethe's above utterances; for then we become attentive that—as already indicated—the human mind harbours elements or forces, or whatever one otherwise wishes to name it, with which we are able to draw nearer to the immediate presence of God than by means of understanding and reason, and indeed these forces root in the sense—and that means in the receiving—part of our nature. We can make it graspable to ourselves through the simple consideration that blind sensations are always more content-rich than objectless thoughts. Certainly no human eye is able to behold God—the mere assumption would be senseless—nevertheless a reflecting contemplation of nature and the impression of high art-creations is able "to lure us near to the threshold where we may look into the splendour of the Godhead …."—not the Godhead itself do we behold, yet the splendour surrounding it. And no matter what one may fancy and teach about the essence of music, we know from experience that—where it gives itself nobly shaped—"it speaks to the deepest best sense of the man and lets him feel his God-likeness livingly." Striking it is how the music always again leads Goethe to God. Thus he says for example of the fugues "of the great master Johann Sebastian Bach": to him it is thereby as if "the eternal harmony conversed with itself, as it might have taken place in God's bosom shortly before the world-creation." The words following thereupon I recommend likewise to the reader for special attention. Goethe continues namely: "So also it moved in my inward and it was to me as if I possessed neither ears, least of all eyes, and further no remaining senses nor needed them" (Letters, W. A. 24, 376). It follows therefrom that the soul-impressions mediated through the senses in especially favourable cases overcome the sensibility and leave it behind them, whereas thoughts always only again lead to thoughts, at best to thought-shapes (ideas). Also to this circumstance great meaning comes; for the man who has once felt God's nearness—what Goethe very finely designates as "his God-likeness"—does not so easily forget that again; whereas proofs can always anew be shaken and overthrown through other proofs and in general exercise only a slight effect upon the mind of most men. If one rethinks in the light of these various results the history of the Christian Church and especially of the Christian theology, one obtains the impression of a single delusion-full aberration, in that understanding and reason grew ever more into the exclusive organs of the ecclesiastically recognized religion. The proper Church-faith—as it still today presents itself in the catechisms of the various confessions—is everywhere where it does not merely reproduce history-narratives naked rationalism, that is reasoning. Such things as the Nicene and the Athanasian Creed offer unsurpassable patterncollections of "empty concepts," of thoughts to which every intuitive object is lacking. Thereby the Church removed itself ever further from the divine mediator to whom it yet owed all that it was. In the heart it held indeed fast to him and drew from that its conquering force, yet it removed itself in regard to disposition and teaching, as well as in its whole essence, ever further and further from the historical Saviour, so that one may without exaggeration assert: Jesus and the Christian Church form religious opposites.

With these considerations we again tread exactly the ground upon which we found ourselves at the beginning of the chapter, and in order not to repeat myself I ask the reader to look up the relevant expositions (pp. 227 ff.). There we had arrived on purely historical way, now fundamental considerations about the human mind lead us back to the same point: the leaping point—the punctum vitae—of our whole considerations. Goethe brings once a mysterious word that is not to be understood without special preparation; the needful preparation we now possess.

He writes: "There are only two true religions, the one that recognizes and adores the Holy that dwells in and around us wholly formless, the other that recognizes and adores it in the most beautiful form. All that lies between is idol-service" (Wander-Years, 3rd Book, "From Makarie's Archive"). Communicated in such brevity and without further elucidation this utterance must for everyone at first remain a riddle; well one divines behind the mysterious words deep wisdom, yet it would prove impossible to fathom the sense rightly if one does not remain mindful of the instruction through Kant that I recalled earlier. True religion can namely only through understanding and reason obtain "form"; as soon as religion borrows its form out of the sense-world, "idol-service" necessarily arises. Now however, as Kant teaches us, understanding- and reasonconcepts, as soon as no intuitions correspond to them, remain empty-of-content: consequently form and content stand in religion to one another in the inverse relation. The more form-perfect a religion becomes, the more will it have to sacrifice of religious content; that is the price that it pays for the significant increase in logical force and in effect-power over numerous men. Against that, whoever harbours a great richness of religious feelings and impulses in the heart will guard himself against conceding to the concept-world more influence than is unconditionally necessary in order to make himself understandable; for form-giving means in this case to set up firm, clear immovable concepts, and for every such concept must the man sacrifice something of the presentiments and experiences that bless him; wherefore he will content himself with the lightest outline-lines and will lay all weight upon the receiving (the philosophers say "suffering") side of the human mind, and that is the side of the immediate, thought-poor, deed-full sense-life. I attach at once again here, only wish beforehand to make attentive that we have now gained a twofold version for Goethe's utterance: if we wish to designate the two "true religions" affirmatively, we will name the one the form-perfect, the other the content-rich; if we prefer the negating version, we must speak of the former as of the content-poor and of the latter as of the formless. By far the most exalted appearance of a "formless religion" we possess in the religion of Jesus: this religion is wholly and entirely content and therefore lays the thinkably least weight upon the questions of form. The allegory of the Father and that of his kingdom almost suffice for all communication-needs of the Saviour; scarcely once does he find himself occasioned to designate the Father expressly as "good" (Mark 10, 18) ….. That is already all known to us and needs no repetitions; only have we in the meantime gained an unequally more light-powerful insight into the connections. We understand now why Jesus sets up no concept-determinations at all about the Godhead; we feel the bold forgery that wished to ascribe to him the Trinity-doctrine as a destroying of his high teaching, and we divine the admixture of Pauline theology in the conversation with Nicodemus as well as in John, chapter 4, verse 24, where the evangelist lets Jesus say: "God is Pneuma" (compare 2 Cor. 3, 17 "The Lord is Pneuma") …. In any case Jesus, if he used an Aramaic word that was to be rendered in Greek by Pneuma (breath, spirit, soul), did not have in mind the then current philosophical-theological meaning of the word Pneuma—as was the case with Paul—but rather simply the defence of the always again pressing Jewish, bodily idea. There are weighty Lord-words of undoubted genuineness that we are accustomed to take much too comfortably lightly, because precisely the Church has never known anything right to begin with them: I will name two as examples. The first runs: "And Jesus called a child to him, set it in the midst of them and spoke: truly I say to you, unless you turn and become as the children, you will never enter into the kingdom of the heavens" (Matt. 18, 3). What now distinguishes the children if not the immediate grasping of all life-impressions as they are mediated to them through the senses, without any after-brooding? The confidence in the immediately surrounding joy at existence makes out their essence.

Among the Galileans who surrounded the Saviour there was well many a childlike soul—for which the example of Peter witnesses; never on the contrary have there been men who resembled children less than those to whom we owe the erection of the ecclesiastical forced articles of faith: they are the sons of an over-educated, age-weak, unfruitful time; knowledge-rich and earnestly striving, yet something aged, joyless, opinionated clings to all their doing. Nothing is less childlike and speaks less to children than the catechism of the Christian churches. This saying turns itself, as one sees, to the generality in order in things of religion to warn against the predominance of the understanding-activity; the second saying directs itself immediately against the Church-men and their teachings: "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and of earth, that thou hast hidden this from wise and understanding ones, and hast revealed it to the unmatured" (Matt. 11, 25 and Luke 10, 21). Such words are all the more noteworthy as in them a not-to-be-explained-away rejection of all theology announces itself. The last-cited affirms still: "yes, Father, for so has it been wellpleasing before thee"—a turn of speech that on Hebrew-Aramaic says as much as "so it pleases thee," "so thou doest gladly": hereby the Saviour speaks this rejection of theological subtleties and this elevation of the spiritual simplicity and innocence and of the receptivity for immediate impressions of the Godhead itself. While my thoughts dwell with Jesus, always again words of Goethe fall into my mind as way-pointers. The word of the sounding that lets the God-likeness be felt, and the other of the beholding that lures near to the threshold where we look into the divine splendour, worked uncommonly clarifying, while that of the formless religion possesses the value of a revelation. Now again, where I ask myself caring whether the reader begins to grasp the religion of Jesus in its deep distinction from the religion of the Christian Church, yes, in its opposition to this, there falls into my mind a word of the same master that fits so exactly upon this point of our considerations as if it arose first now for our illumination. Goethe names once the Godhead: "our Father, the ungraspable yet the touchable" (Letter to Stolberg of 26. 10. 75). That could Jesus have spoken; for he teaches us to "touch" God everywhere in the world, at every step, revering, and teaches yet at the same time that God is not "graspable" and consequently not "comprehensible"—for, we know it yes, a concept to which no object corresponds remains empty, and whoever grasps after God in the delusion of comprehending him grasps after a shadow. Therefore it falls easier to the simplicity and the "poor in spirit" to arrive at God and into his kingdom than to the "knowing and circumspect" (sapientibus et prudentibus). In contrast to the Church-doctrine Jesus, as one sees, lays the main weight not upon the reason but upon the feeling related to the senses. Both strivings may—as Goethe wishes—deserve the designation as "true religion"; yet can no question be that Jesus places the formless religion higher than that which strives after beautiful form. True he shows respect before every upright faith and perseveres until his life-end in the religious community in which he had grown up: this happens however only because his own teaching stands exalted over every form and therefore is able to exercise tolerance toward every other. This tolerance should however not make us blind for the many fundamentally distinguishing things between the religion of Jesus and the religion of the Christian Church: one take for example the concept of faith standing in the mid-point of both religions. Always and everywhere Jesus understands under "faith" the trust in his divine mission, in his mediation of divine essence and divine force; this trust suffices for redemption. Never is any confession demanded; the woman who, without opening the mouth, touches him "only from behind on the garment," is healed: "Daughter, thy faith has helped thee." Immediately thereafter it says opposite the ruler of the Jewish synagogue: "Fear not, only believe" (Mark 5, 34 and 36). Exactly so however the Saviour speaks to the heathen; thus for example he calls to the Canaanite woman: "O woman, thy faith is great!" (Matt. 15, 28) and of the Roman centurion he says: "With no one in Israel have I found such faith!" (Matt. 8, 10).

Already these few places suffice for the irrefutable proof that Jesus understands under "faith" something fundamentally different from the Church: to the worshipper of Baal and Astarte the Saviour ascribes faith in the same sense as to the Jewess and the synagogue-ruler; yet to the Roman warrior—who performs his oaths by Jupiter and Mars—he praises even higher faith-force than is anywhere to be found in Israel. Here therefore is not the speech of a series of articles of faith—still less relating to ungraspable things—rather the Saviour designates with this word a stirring and movement of the will in a definite direction; this elevation of the essence is it that enables such men to recognize the Saviour as God-sent—and have they recognized him, so is thereby—as said—everything happened. Rightly considered it is a monstrosity when, footing upon this teaching, a Church erects itself between the man and his Saviour and takes it upon itself to declare: only if thou believest point for point all that I teach, enterest thou into the salvation. Again a word of Goethe falls into my memory, suited as few to throw light upon this question that may still appear dark to many,—so hard falls it to unwind oneself out of inherited and learned ideas to freedom; the teaching of Jesus however forms the high school of the soul-freedom. In Poetry and Truth (Book 14) Goethe narrates of conversations that he cultivated in young years with ecclesiastically pious friends and in which he combated their orthodoxy: "with the faith, said I, all depends upon that one believes; what one believes is wholly indifferent. The faith is a great feeling of security for the present and future, and this security springs out of the trust in an over-great, over-powerful and unsearchable Being. Upon the unshakability of this trust all depends: how we however think this Being, this hangs upon our remaining capacities, yes, upon the circumstances, and is wholly indifferent. The faith is a holy vessel into which each one stands ready to sacrifice his feeling, his understanding, his imagination, so good as he is able." To this utterance the mid-point, Jesus Christ, is indeed lacking; the connection however presupposes him; for the rest it can pass as the most eloquent interpretation of the above words of the Saviour. True Goethe himself designates his utterance, done in youthful over-mut, as "half-truth"; yet it possesses the great merit of directing the attention upon that half of the truth that has vanished from our eyes under the long-enduring influence of the Church. To us there floats with the word "faith" the idea of a highly complicated spiritual process, containing historical convictions that reach back to the creation of the world, together with manifold metaphysical statements about the essence of the Godhead as well as about its intentions, salvation-plans, promises and threats, finally determinations about special mysteries (sacraments); Jesus on the contrary designates—as we have seen, and as lets itself easily be proved more fully—with the word "faith" a primal-simple fundamental mood of the mind that can be proper or not to every man, at every epoch, in every surrounding, at every degree of spiritual development. About the faith we have often treated in this book (see especially pp. 65 ff. and 211 ff.), and I will not repeat what has been said; yet all questions present themselves to us now in another angle than earlier, whereby they obtain new meaning. I imagine to myself that my reader now beholds without further the separating cleft that divides that which Jesus understands under faith from that which the churches wish to have understood under it: it is a matter of two wholly unequal world-views,—true not of that which the logician names a contradictory (that is excluding) opposition, yet of a contrary, that is of an opposed conception. Confirmed and strengthened is this opposition through the mutual conception of the sin, which stands in the most intimate connection with the conception of the faith. Also with this subject we have occupied ourselves in the third chapter (pp. 124 ff.), which now enables us brief brevity. There we saw the Christian Church from the very beginning teach a "religion of the sin," whereby I wish to say that the concept of the sin (together with the complementing concept of the sin-forgiveness) forms the axis around which both the outer mythical picture of the salvation-plan and the inner mystical-religious knowledge turn. That is a result of Jewish schooling and goes back to Paul and the other apostles—always with the exception of John. With the Jews however the concept of the sin bore a simple and unambiguous sense: sin was the non-following of Yahveh's, at historically definite times arbitrarily issued commands: to eat a forbidden food, to grant knightly sparing to the enemy (1 Sam. 15, 8 ff.) was exactly as punishable as deceit and murder; with them all remained that was not expressly forbidden—and might the action be ever so base—allowed and lay outside the concept of the sin.

With the falling-away of the Jewish law—the first immediate success of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth—this Jewish concept of the sin found itself eo ipso annihilated, and in its place stepped the incomparably more fine-sense Aryan knowledge of the conscience as "sun to our moral day," where no more is asked after a written law-book, no more after reward and punishment, but after the inner unerring voice that distinguishes the good from the evil. The Jewish teaching of the sin is unfalsified materialism; the Aryan conception of the conscience means the knowledge of a metaphysical fact of the human mind, which the faith in God transfigures into a divine ordinance. Nothing is more characteristic for the wholly un-Jewish in the religion of Jesus than its behaviour opposite the sin. It would mean to proceed very superficially if one wished to judge that Jesus lays little weight upon the sin; and yet the judgment would be justified from the Jewish standpoint as well as from the standpoint of the Christian Church—one needs only to think of the examples drawn in of the robber, of the adulteress and of the town-known sinneress in the third chapter; one asks oneself how it is possible that the men take such things in without becoming startled and noticing that here the spirit of another religion speaks. In that the sin consists no more in the transgression of a law-prescription, but in the perversity of the will-direction and in the weakness of the will-force, it finds itself that no man is more able to fall a judgment over it—wherefore also the Saviour solemnly admonishes us: "Judge not!" (Matt. 7, 1); for the question now concerns the innermost soul-stirrings of the man and requires the exact knowledge of the relevant personality in its being and in its becoming, as well as of all accompanying circumstances: that goes plainly beyond man-force. Above all however: the axis of the religion of Jesus forms the faith, all other—thereunder also the sin—possesses secondary value. From numerous, undoubted reliable reports we obtain the decided impression that Jesus preferred the society of outspoken sinners to that of the so-called "righteous," and indeed that happened because he found hearing sooner among them. As soon as the sinner believes, the sin falls from him as if it had never been; whereas also a fullness of virtues cannot replace the lacking enthusiastic elevation of the soul to God, which Jesus names "faith." We stand here before a mystery that wraps the way that leads from man to God.

The author of the Theologia Deutsch writes in the deep simplicity of his heart: "The hell and the heaven-kingdom are two good sure ways (to God) for the man in this time" (11th chap.); whereby he states that the sin and its consequences can lead just as well to God as orthodoxy and good works. To no man comes a judgment over the soul-meaning of the sin of another: neither can he know from where it comes nor whither it leads. From numerous cases it is known to us that men who distinguished themselves in regard to God-faith and devotion to the eternal things had earlier wandered the way of passionate aberration. One go therefore not carelessly past the compassion of Jesus with the sinners and past his love to them. This divine love and wisdom forms an opposition to the very human wisdom of the Church in regard to the good and the bad. Martin Luther knew that well and has given expression to this knowledge in his letter to the Augustinian monk Georg Spenlein: "Guard yourselves that you never strive after such great purity wherein you would not seem or even be a sinner. For Christ dwells only in sinners" (7. 4. 1516). In this thought-series the closing knowledge results however first out of the following insight: the coming of a mediator between man and God lets the various dogma-buildings, as well as the whole apparatus of the customs forced by the churches, appear altogether as unnecessary, in that all human attempts are now abolished through this divine ordinance.

In the mediator "the object in the intuition" finds itself given—"for in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2, 9)—and thereby with one blow perception and concepts both become content-rich, yes, inexhaustibly content-rich. Henceforth it suffices to believe in the mediator—and that means to grasp him, each one as it succeeds best for him, be it with the beating heart, be it with the reflecting soul, and to cling fast to him: thereby God's presence is already acquired and the man steps without further into the Father's kingdom. The believers who torment themselves with ascetic exercises and with all sorts of ecclesiastical observances Paul admonishes to leave off: "You are dead and your life is hidden with Christ in God" (Col. 3, 3). With the faith in Christ the redemption is already accomplished, and every further care means a relapse into the aberrations of the human reason. This founds a religion of the immediacy that demands nothing further at all from the man than love to the Redeemer and faith in his mediator-office.

We saw at the close of the Paul-chapter with what glowing fervour the "founder of the churches that are in Christ" grasped this all-embracing unique truth (p. 223), to which also our Luther with the manly straightness proper to him gives expression: "through Jesus Christ must thou believe in God … there will he let himself be found and otherwise not." "I am the way and the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father except through me."

Note on this Edition

This text is a reformatted version of Houston Stewart Chamberlain's Man and God. The original layout from the 1922 edition has been cleaned for modern reading. Paragraphs are joined. Hyphenations at line ends are removed. The content remains unchanged. Typography uses clear fonts and spacing for ease of reading. May Christ be with you, dear reader's.

This is the first complete English translation of Houston Stewart Chamberlain's Mensch und Gott (1921). The work remained untranslated for more than a century.